beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1995.

..*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: Madam, I introduce the Bill.

MOTION ON DISCUSSION ON SITUATION IN CHARAR-E-SHARIEF Contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the Home Minister is here... (*Interruptions*)...Actually, no party's time has been left as four hours were allocated and five hours and thirty-one minutes have already been consumed. Now, if you want to have more discussion, I can ask the Home Minister to reply.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh): The Prime Minister has to reply....(*Interruptions*) प्राइम मिनिस्टर को रिप्लाई करना चाहिए, होम मिनिस्टर को नहीं (व्यवधान)... इसका रिप्लाई कल प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने लोक सभा में किया था। ..(व्यवधान)...

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): I had told the House yesterday only that I was prepared to reply to the debate yesterday itself, but some more hon. Members wanted to speak. That is why all that time I told that the Prime Minister would not be able to come. I am going to reply to what has been said here in the Rajya Sabha...(*Interruptions*)... Everybody accepted that.

श्री अनेश्वर मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदया राज्य सभा के साथ यह... (व्यवधान)...

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (बिहार): यह राज्य सभा का अपमान है।..(व्यवधान)..

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय: यह राज्य सभा का अपमान है (व्यवधान)

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: कल चेयरमैन साहब के सामने यह बात कही गई थी कि चव्हाण साहब नोट लेंगे और जवाब इसका प्रधानमंत्री जी देंगे। पिछले पांच दिनों से लगातार इस बात पर हम जोर दे रहे है। कोई सम्मान ही नहीं है प्रधानमंत्री जी के मन में इस सदन के बारे में। बुद्धवार से लगातार एक हफ्ता हो गया है (व्यवधान)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal) What is the use if the Prime Minister does not come?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I have a submission to make. (Interruptions)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamilnadu): The Home Minister is not in charge of Kashmir. He is also not in charge of Defence. It is not proper for him to give a reply. The Prime Minister is accountable. He is responsible for this and the person responsible for this should come.

विपक्ष के नेता (श्री सिकन्दर बख्त): चेयरमैन साहब के साथ बैठकर आज सुबह यह तय हो गया आपकी मौजूदगी में तय हो गया फिर अब यह सवाल उठाकर के डिसक्शन को कट शार्ट नहीं करना चाहिये। दूसरी चीज यह है कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब कैसे जवाब दे सकते हैं? आपसे वह महकमा लिया जा चुका है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के पास वह महकमा है (व्यवधान) बिलकुल गलत बात है (व्यवधान) प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के पास वह महकमा है इसलिए प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को इसका जवाब देने के लिए आना होगा। (व्यवधान)

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

†[मैंने तो दो दफा दिल "शरी सकंदर बख्त" चेयरमैन साहब के साथ बैठकर कि सुबह यह तय हो गया आपकी मौजूदगी में तय हो गया फिर अब यह सवाल उठाकर के डिसकशन को शार्ट नहीं करना चाहिये - दूसरी चीज यह है कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब कैसे जवाब दे सकते हैं - आपसे वह महकमा लिया जा चुका है - मिनिस्टर साहब के पास वह महकमा है - "मदाखलत" बिल्कुल गलत बात है - "मदाखलत" प्राईम मिनिस्टर साहब के पास वह महकमा है - इसलिये प्राईम मिनिस्टर साहब को इसका जवाब देने के लिये आना ही होगा - "मदाखलत"]

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam, we have respect for the Home Minister. The Prime Minister is in the Lok Sabha. We request the Prime Minister to come to the Rajya Sabha to give a reply.

श्री एस० बी० चव्हाण : कल शाम जब यह डिसक्शन हो रहा था उस वक्त आप तशरीफ नहीं रखते थे । यहां पर और उस वक्त यह तय हुआ कि मैं जवाब देने वाला हूं (**व्यवधान**)

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : तय नहीं हुआ था (**व्यवधान**)

श्री एस० बी० चव्हाण : हमारी बात सुन लीजिये (**व्यवधान**) आप ही आवाज उठा सकते हैं (**व्यवधान**)

उपसभापति : आप बैठिए, लीडर आफ दी हाऊस की बात सुन लीजिये (**व्यवधान**)

श्री एस० बी० चव्हाण : हमेशा इतनी जोर से आप कहते हैं । हम लोगों को क्या बोलने का कोई भी अख्तियार नहीं है ? क्या तरीका है हमेशा (**व्यवधान**)

उपसभापति : लीडर आफ दी हाऊस की बात सुनने दीजिये (**व्यवधान**) ऐसे नहीं करिये (**व्यवधान**)

श्री एस० बी० चव्हाण : कल शाम जब यहां बहस हो रही थी तो कल मैंने खुद ही कहा था कि इस सारी डिस्कशन का मैं ही जवाब देने वाला हूं । मैंने कहा यदि आप चाहें तो मैं अभी जवाब देने के लिए तैयार हूं लेकिन अगर आप कुछ मैम्बर्ज को बोलने की इजाजत देना चाहते हैं तो it is, after all, the discretion of the Chair. उसके बाद मैं जवाब देने वाला हूं । कल ही मैंने यह साफ किया था । सारे हाऊस को इस बात की जानकारी है । कल आप तशरीफ नहीं रखते थे । (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: It is a serious matter. कल चेयरमैन साहब के सामने कहा था । बुद्धवार से लगातार हम लोग कह रहे हैं । गृह मंत्रालय के जिम्मे यह नहीं है इस विभाग के जिम्मेदार यह नहीं हैं तो जवाब कैसे दे सकते हैं (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, you kindly identify me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, I identify you .

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Why should the Prime Minister not come to this House? The Prime Minister should come to this House.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, we hold the Leader of the House in the highest esteem not only because he is the Leader of the House but also because he is one of the senior-most leaders of the country. I am one

†[]Transliteration in Arabic Script.

of those who admire Parliamentary competence. The question is this. He is not dealing with the subject of Kashmir. It is, no doubt, true. He told the House yesterday that he would reply to the debate. His statement is not the same as the decision by the House. We were not privy to that decision We were all the time demanding a reply from the Prime Minister One of the reasons why we allowed the debate to spill over today was to enable the Prime Minister to reply to the debate. Yesterday, the Prime Minister had legitimate reasons and so, he could not be present in this House. He had to reply to the debate in that House which is equally important. We concede that. But, today, he is relatively free Of course, the Prme Minister is always busy. Therefore, Madam, since he is dealing with this matter, is it improper for us to demand that he should come? We would welcome the intervention of the Home Minister. We welcome it. But we demand, we insist on an approriate reply from the Prime Minister. He has the duty and we have the right.

सैयद सिब्ते रजी (उत्तर प्रदेश): माननीय सदस्यों की भावनाओं का हमारी पार्टी की सरकार ने हमेशा आदर किया है। जैसे अभी हमारे रेड्डी साहब ने कहा कि कल प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां नहीं आ सके उसका कोई रीजन था, उस रीजन से वे एग्री भी करते हैं। जहां तक मेरी सूचना है प्रधान मंत्री जी आज भी लोक सभा में प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय के जवाब के सिलसिले में व्यस्त हैं तो ऐसी परिस्थिति में एक आदमी दो हाउसेज में कैसे जा सकता है। जहां तक सवाल यह है कि हमारे लीडर आफ दी हाउस जवाब दे सकते हैं या नहीं वे पूरे कम्पीटेंस में हैं। जहां तक प्रधान मंत्री जी का सवाल है वे आज भी लोक सभा में जहां तक मेरी सूचना है प्रतिरक्षा बजट का जवाब देने के सिलसिले में वहां पर है। आप ही बताइए कि वे कैसे आ सकते हैं। अब आप यह कहें कि जब तक प्रधान मंत्री नहीं आएंगे हम सुनेंगे नहीं,

यह आपका पक्ष हो सकता है लेकिन चरारे शरीफ एक बहुत ही अहम मसला है, अब वहां पर क्या परिस्थिति है, वहां पर क्या डेवलपमेंट हुआ है इसके बारे में हमने अपने जो विचार रखे हैं, सरकार किस हद तक उन विचारों से सहमत है हम इसका जवाब चाहते है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि प्रतिपक्ष उन जवाबों को हासिल करने में अवरोध पदा नही करेगा। इस इश्यू को राजनैतिक इश्यू नहीं बनाएं यह आधार लेकर कि प्रधान मंत्री जी नही हैं, इसलिए इनको सुनना नहीं चाहते हैं। हम सुनना चाहते हैं और हम आपकी ओर से सुरक्षा चाहते हैं क्योंकि इस हाउस की परम्पराओं को सुरक्षित रखने की जिम्मेदारी जितनी प्रतिपक्ष की ओर से आपकी है उतनी ही सत्ता पक्ष की ओर से भी आपकी है। इसलिए मैं आपसे अनुरोध करना चाहता हूं कि आप अपनी शक्ति का प्रयोग कर जो चरारे शरीफ के संबंध में हमने कल नुक्ते रखे हैं उनका हमें माननीय नेता सदन से जवाब दिलाएं।

†سید سبط رضی "اتر پردیش":
مانیے سدسیوں کی بھاونا ؤں کا ہماری
پارٹی کی سرکار نے ہمیشہ آدر کیا ہے۔
جیسے ابھی ہمارے ریڈی صاحب نے
کہا کہ کل پردھان منتری جی یہاں نہیں
آ سکے۔ اسکا ریزن تھا۔ اس ریزن
سے وہ ایگری بھی کرتے ہیں۔ جہانتک میری
سوچنا ہے پردھان منتری جی آج بھی
لوک سبھا میں "پرتی رکھشا منترالیہ"
کے جواب کے سلسلے میں ویستھ ہیں
تو ایسی پرستھتی میں ایک آدمی دو
ہاؤسز میں کیسے جا سکتا ہے۔ جہاں

†[ ]Transliteration in Arabic Script.

تک سوال یہ ہے کہ ہمارے لیڈر آف
دی ھاؤس جواب دے سکتے ہیں یا
نہیں - وہ پورے کمپیٹنس میں ہیں -
جہاں تک پردھان منتری کا سوال ہے
وہ آج بھی لوک سبھا میں جہاں تک میری
سوچنا ہے "پرتی رکھشا بجٹ" کا
جواب دینے کے سلسلے میں وہاں پر ہیں -
آپ ہی بتائیے وہ کیسے آسکتے ہیں -
اب آپ یہ کہیں کہ جب تک پردھان
منتری نہیں آئینگے ہم سنیں گے نہیں -
یہ آپکا پکشن ہو سکتا ہے لیکن "چرارے
شریف" ایک بہت ہی اہم مسئلہ ہے -
اب وہاں پر کیا پرستھتی ہے - وہاں پر کیا
ڈیولپمنٹ ہوا ہے اسکے بارے میں
ہم نے جو وچار رکھے ہیں سرکار کس حد
تک ان وچاروں سے متفق ہے ہم اسکا
جواب چاہتے ہیں - مجھے امید ہے کہ "پرتی
پکشن" ان جوابوں کو حاصل کرنے میں رکاوٹ
پیدا نہیں کرے گا - اس ایشو کو اجینک
ایشو نہ بنائیں - یہ آدھار لیکر کے پردھان
منتری جی نہیں ہیں اسلئے انکو سننا نہیں
چاہتے ہیں - ہم سننا چاہتے ہیں اور آپکی
طرف سے سرکھشا چاہتے ہیں - کیونکہ
اس ھاؤس کی پرمپراؤں کو سرکھشت
رکھنے کی ذمہ داری جتنی "پرتی پکشن"

†[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

کی طرف سے آپکی ہے اتنی ہی "سمستہ پکش
کی طرف سے بھی آپکی ہے - اسلئے میں
آپ سے انورودھ کرنا چاہتا ہوں
کہ آپ اپنی شکتی کا پریوگ کرکے جو
"چرارے شریف" کے سمبندھ میں ہم نے
کل رکھے ہیں انکا ہمیں مانیہ نیتا
سدن سے جواب دلائیں - "دھنیواد"

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam, please permit me to say a word. When the discussion was going on yesterday... (*Interruptions*)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, yesterday, I made the point that we want the Prime Minister to come and give the reply to the debate I said that although we would appreciate the intervention by the Home Minister, we would prefer the Prime Minister coming and giving the reply, Madam, this is for no other reason than the one that the Home Minister is not handling the Kashmir portfolio, but it is the Prime Minister who is dealing with this issue. That is why we requested that the Prime Minister should come and give the reply. Therefore, Madam, we would like the Prime Minister to respond to the discussion. I request you. The Prime Minister should come and give the reply.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: The Prime Minister had already replied in the Lok Sabha yesterday. Therefore, it is but fair that he should reply in this House also. Since he has already replied in the Lok Sabha, he should come and reply here today. (*Interruptions*)

†[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): Madam, I have been seeking your permission for the last half-an-hour. Please allow me to speak. You are allowing all other Members. ..*(Interruptions)*.... ..

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: This House has equally the right. Madam, you should give a direction to the Prime Minister. You should ask him to come and give the reply. This has been our demand. The leaders of all the parties from the Opposition have made this demand. Therefore, it is but proper that he comes here and responds to the discussion. Of course, we all have respect for the Leader of the House, the hon. Home Minister. But since it is the Prime Minister who is dealing with Jammu and Kashmir Affairs, he should reply to the points raised by the Members. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Madam, please permit me to speak. I have been requesting you. *(Interruptions)*. ..

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : मुझे इजाजत दी है उन्होंने . . . **(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chimanbhai Mehta, you have not been requesting for half-an-hour. It is contrary to facts. I have got the record. I am looking at the watch more than you. Please take your seat. I will call you when the atmosphere is peaceful and your voice can be heard Shri Digvijay Singh please.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : उपसभापति महोदया, मैं जब यह मांग कर रहा हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी इस पर जवाब दें उस समय मेरे मन में कोई यह मंशा नहीं है कि हम लोग गृह मंत्री जी को कोई इनकम्पीटेंट आदमी समझ रहे हैं । मेरे मन में गृह मंत्री जी के लिए पूरी इज्जत, पूरा सम्मान है । मैं उनको राष्ट्र के नेता के रूप में देखता हूं लेकिन इस सवाल से जुड़े हुए कई बयान पिछले दो दिनों से भारत सरकार के मंत्रियों के आ रहे है । उसमें से एक बयान यह है कि पाकिस्तान पर चढ़ाई कर देनी चाहिए । यह जाफर शरीफ का बयान कल आया है । मैं इस मामले की गम्भीरता को समझकर प्रधान मंत्री के लिए इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि आज पूरा राष्ट्र जानना चाहता है । एक मंत्री का बयान जा रहा है, वह भी प्रेस में कि चरारे शरीफ में जो आग लगायी है पाकिस्तानियों ने उसके मुकाबले में पाकिस्तान पर चढ़ाई कर देनी चाहिए । क्या हमारे लिए यह बात जानकारी के लिए है या नही ? प्रधान मंत्री ऐसे सवालों पर आकर जवाब दें । क्या मंत्रिमंडल की जिम्मेदारी सब मंत्रियों पर बराबर की है या नहीं ? इस बात की जानकारी लेने का हमें हक है या नहीं ? इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी इस पर जवाब दें । एक तो यह विभाग उनके पास है दूसरे मंत्रियों के बयान आ रहे हैं और एक मंत्री का बयान माने सरकार का बयान है । आज देश में कौन सा मैसेज जा रहा है । इसलिए उपसभापति महोदया, मैं चव्हाण साहब का पूरा सम्मान रखते हुए चाहता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी आएं और सदन में चरारे शरीफ की घटनाओं पर बयान दें । तमाम चीजें आ गयी है खाली चरारे शरीफ की घटना नहीं रह गयी है । यह मामला उससे आगे चला गया है । इसलिए सारी चीजों में प्रधान मंत्री ही कम्पीटेंट आदमी हैं जो इस पर जवाब दे सकते हैं । हम जानना चाहते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री की राय इसमें क्या है ।

उपसभापति : देखिए इस पर बहस करने की क्या जरूरत है । यह आपकी डिमांड है । यह प्रधान मंत्री की सरकार है । प्रधान मंत्री की सरकार की जिम्मेदारी है, इट इज ज्वाइंट रेसपांसिबिलिटी अगर वह लोक सभा में बिजी हैं तो किसी भी मंत्री को नियुक्त कर सकते हैं कि वह इस हाउस में जवाब दें और होम मिनिस्टर साहब इस हाऊस के नेता हैं । अगर आप उनकी . . . **(व्यवधान)** आप उनकी बात सकून से सुनिए । वह क्या कहना चाह रहे हैं । उसके बाद आपके कोई सवाल होंगे तो उनके सामने रख दीजिए । वह जवाब ले कर बता देंगे । . . . **(व्यवधान)**

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदया, अगर ज्वाइंट रिसपांसिबिलिटी है तो क्या जाफर शरीफ का बयान जिसका उल्लेख इन्होंने किया है यह उस ज्वाइंट रेसपांसिबिलिट के तहत आता है या नहीं ? . . . (**व्यवधान**)

उपसभापति : आप उनसे सवाल पूछिए ।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : अगर आता है तो क्या यह सरकार की नीति है और वह भी सदन के बाहर उन्होंने बयान दिया है । एक बड़ा भारी नीति का बयान दिया है । यह बयान वह कैसे दे सकते हैं ? . . . (**व्यवधान**)

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : महोदया. . . (**व्यवधान**) पब्लिकली बयान दें. . . (**व्यवधान**)

उपसभापति : अब वह आप. . . (**व्यवधान**) होम मिनिस्टर साहब बोलेंगे. . . (**व्यवधान**)

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : हम प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहते हैं । यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बात है । . . . (**व्यवधान**)

उपसभापति : जोशी जी, एक मिनट । जोशी जी, जब वह सवाल आप करेंगे तो होम मिनिस्टर साहब जवाब देंगे । अभी मैं पहले से कैसे बता दं । इसलिए अभी आप सब लोग बैठिए । . . . (**व्यवधान**) अभी तो लोग बोलने के लिए बाकी हैं। मगर सवाल यह है कि. . . (**व्यवधान**) मैं किसी को इजाजत नहीं दे रही हूं । . . . . (**व्यवधान**) बैठिए, बैठ जाइये । (**व्यवधान**) अभी आप बैठिए ।

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: At least we should know the difficulty of the Prime Minister in coming and replying to the debate here. Yesterday he was engaged. Today he can come and reply.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is engaged on Defence.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: We are prepared to wait. If he can't come now, let him come in the afternoon... (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what he said.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: There is a State Minister there. He can do so . . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Let him give the time, whatever time is convenient to him, at which he can come and reply to it here.

उपसभापति : बैठिए, शुक्ल जी बतायेंगे . . . . (**व्यवधान**) बैठिए बैठिए । शुक्ल जी जवाब देंगे । . . (**व्यवधान**)

मौलाना अबैदुल्ला खान आजमी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मेरा एक प्वायंट आफ आर्डर है । . . (**व्यवधान**)

उपसभापति : नहीं-नहीं । प्वायंट आफ आर्डर कुछ नहीं है । वह बोल रहे हैं । बैठिए आप बैठ जाइये । प्लीज सिट डाउन. . (**व्यवधान**) कुछ नहीं उनको पहले सुनने दीजिए । वह क्या कह रहे हैं पहले मुझे मालूमात हो तब मैं जवाब दे सकती हूं । . . . (**व्यवधान**)

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES AND THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA): Madam, as Defence Minister, the PM has to reply to the Demands for Grants debate in the Lok Sabha, for which he is waiting there. It is now getting one o'clock. Mr. Chandrajit Yadav was speaking. If the debate on the Demands is not over before lunch, he will have to reply after lunch. After his reply. he will be free from that House.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Let him come after that. . .(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish. Let him finish, please. please, please.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Madam, as you have rightly observed, I want to tell the hon. Members here that all of us who are Members

of the Cabinet are entitled to speak as authoritatively as the Prime Minister on everything, including even the Statement made by our colleague. ..(*Interruptions*).... ..

May I complete my submission?

So, the Leader of the House, myself or anybody else can speak here or in the Lok Sabha on behalf of any of us. The hon. Members have been insisting on the concept of joint responsibility. We certainly accept that. It is not that we want, just as suggested,... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: Do you accept Mr. Jaffer Sharief's statement? Is it a statement given by the Government? Do you accept it? .. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Let me complete... (*Interruptions*) Don't show this anger... (*Interruptions*)

I can say that.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : वह कहें कि सरकार की तरफ से उन्होंने बयान दिया है ।... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : : यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं हम लोग अपना रहे हैं । .. (व्यवधान)

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: I am on the question of joint responsibility. Will the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs accept that the statement given by Mr. Jaffer Sharief as a Cabinet Minister, is a statement by the Government?

उपसभापति : जोशी जी पहले पूरी बात कर लेने दीजिए । (व्यवधान)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Madam, I am entitled and authorised to say whatever I want to say in that respect. Whether it is a Government statement or his own statement. I can say it with the same authority as that of the Prime Minister. There is no difficulty about it.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: What are you saying? Are you agreeing wth him or not? ..(*Interruptions*)

उपसभापति : बैठिए, बैठ जाइए । आप पहले उन्हें पूरी बात कह लेने दीजिए Please sit do wn. Please keep quiet. I think my requests also go on deaf ears. I do not know which way I should speak. कौनसी जुबान में बोलूं मुझे मालम नही । अगर पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर कुछ कह रहे हैं decency demands, propriety demands your necessity demands that you listen to him because he is the one who is going to tell me what the situation is and who is to come and reply. So, please keep quiet at least for five minutes. (*Interruptions*) Nothing except what Mr. Shukla says is going on record. I am not allowing anybody else. (Interruptions) He is a decent person. Unfortunately or fortunately he still knows what Parliamentary decency is. He sits down when the Chair gets up. Now, everybody gets up when I get up.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Madam, I was submitting that we Ministers, are authorised to speak on behalf of the Government and we also authoritatively can state what the position of Mr. Jaffer Sharief's statement, which he has made is. We can say that. Therefore, I would say that the Leader of the House and Home Minister, who has been dealing with the discussion in the Lok Sabha as well as in the Rajya Sabha should be allowed to speak on behalf of the Government. He is fully authorised and he can speak as authoritatively as the Prime Minister can on the subject. Therefore, the hon. House should allow the Home Minister to reply to the debate here. One minute more please Please be a little patient. Whenever any particular question arises, which necessi-

tates the Prime Minister's presence here and his statement here, he will certainly come. There is no difficulty in the Prime Minister coming here and making a statement. But, I think, it is in the fitness of things that the Home Minister should be allowed to reply to the debate on Charar-e-Sharif. Then we have to go on to various other issues and the Prime Minister will certainly come and intervene wherever the Chair directs or the hon. Members want him to, but this particular thing should not be held up because the Prime Minister is unable to come, because Defence debate has been stretching tthere unnecessarily for quite long. We never anticipated that it would go on till now. It might go on till 4 o'clock. Therefore, I think that he should be alolwed. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Madam, if the hon. Minister has finished. ...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Madam; I am extremely grateful to the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs for giving us lessons about Parliamentary rules or Parliamentay functions. We ae exteremely grateful to him.

मैं समझ सकता हूं सब कुछ लेकिन मैं यह बताना चाहता हूं कि

†[मैं समझता हूं सब कुछ लेकिन मैं यह बताना चाहता हूं कि]

This is also within its right. He knows it.

इस हाउस का यह हक है मतालबा करने के लिए कि किस चीज का जवाब देने के लिए प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को यहां आना चाहिए । हम भी मतालबा करने का हक रखते हैं । आप कहते हैं कि हमारा हक है कि किसी को भी अख्तियार दे दें कि यहां आकर जवाब द । हमने आपको सुन लिया । हमारे अख्तियार को मानिए कि हम मतालबा कर सकते हैं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब आएं । हमारा मतालबा बुनियादी तौर पर इस बात के ऊपर है कि इस सब्जैट का बराएरास्त प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब का ताल्लुक है बिल्कुल इसी तरह से जैसे डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री से उनका वहां ताल्लुक है। मैं जयपाल रेड्डी साहब की बात को दोहराना चाहता हूं कि चौहान साहब का एहतराम कितना हमारे दिल में है उसको दोहराने की जरूरत नहीं है । He knows it. लेकिन यहां सवाल बिल्कुल दूसरा है । जयपाल रेड्डी साहब ने सजैस्ट किया है, होम मिनिस्टर साहब बोलना चाहते हैं, इंटरवीन करना चाहते हैं लेकिन इसका जवाब हम मतालबा करते हैं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को ही आकर देना चाहिए ।

†[شری سکندر بخت: اس ھاؤس کا یہ حق ہے مطالبہ کرنے کیلئے کہ کس چیز کا جواب دینے کیلئے پرائم منسٹر صاحب کو یہاں آنا چاہیئے - ہم بھی مطالبہ کرنے کا حق رکھتے ہیں - آپ کہتے ہیں کہ ہمارا حق ہے کہ کسی کو بھی اختیار دیدیں کہ یہاں آکر جواب دے - ہم نے آپکو سن لیا - ہمارے اختیار کو مانئے کہ ہم مطالبہ کر سکتے ہیں کہ پرائم منسٹر صاحب آئیں - ہمارا مطالبہ بنیادی طور پر اس بات کے اوپر ہے کہ اس سبجیکٹ سے براہ راست پرائم منسٹر صاحب کا تعلق ہے بالکل]

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

†[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

اسی طرح سے جیسے ڈفنس منسٹری سے انکا وہاں تعلق ہے - میں جے پال ریڈی صاحب کی بات کو دھرانا چاہتا ہوں کہ چوان صاحب کا احترام کرتے ہوئے دل میں سے اسکو دھرانے کی ضرورت نہیں ہے He Knows it: لیکن یہاں سوال بالکل دوسرا ہے - جے پال ریڈی صاحب نے سجیسٹ کیا ہے - ہوم منسٹر صاحب بولنا چاہتے ہیں - انٹرون کرنا چاہتے ہیں - لیکن اسکا جواب ہم مطالبہ کرتے ہیں کہ پرائم منسٹر صاحب کو ہی کر دینا چاہئے [†]

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी : मैडम, मैंने एक प्रश्न किया था । बहुत स्पष्ट और सीधा सवाल किया था पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर से । उन्होंने यह बात यहां रखी है कि सारी सरकार के मिनिस्टर्स को सरकार की पालिसी के बारे में ऐलान करने का हक है और हर विषय पर हरेक मिनिस्टर बोल सकता है ।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala) : Madam, what is the issue.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : मैडम कल जाफर शरीफ साहब ने यह बयान दिया है जो कि अखबारों में छपा है कि पाकिस्तान पर चढ़ाई कर देनी चाहिए । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि आपका इस बयान के बारे में क्या ख्याल है ? क्या यह बयान ज्वाइंट रिस्पांसिबिलिटी के मुताबिक ठीक है ? क्या यह बयान सरकार का है ? यह कुछ सवालात हैं । इसके पहले राजेश पायलेट जी कि मिनिस्टर आफ स्टेट फार होम अफेयर्सज हैं उन्होंने कहा था । ... **(व्यवधान)** ...

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, here in the newspaper report it said: "Sharif wants India to wage war on Pakistan." (*Interuptions*).

1.00 P.M.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी: यह सवाल है जो हम जानना चाहते हैं । क्या यह बयान ज्वायट रेस्पोन्सिबिलिटी के तहत दिया गया है ? ... **(व्यवधान)** ... क्या सरकार इस बात से सहमत है क्या आप सहमत हैं ? ... **(व्यवधान)** ... म इस सवाल का जवाब जानना चाहता हूं ।

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamilnadu): The Home Minister can reply in the Lok Sabha and the Prime Minister can reply here.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Madam, in reply to the query made by the hon. Member, Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi about Shri Jaffer Sharieffji ... (*Interuptions*) ...

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : मैडम पाइंट आफ आर्डर । यह जो माननीय सदस्य पाइंट आफ आर्डर रेज कर रहे हैं उनके लिए मेरा कहना था कि एक-एक माननीय सदस्य का जवाब मंत्री जी न दें बल्कि सबका सुनकर इकट्ठा जवाब दें । ... **(व्यवधान)** ...

THE DEPUTY CHHIRMAN: Just a minute. Please don't argue.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : पाइंट आफ आर्डर रेज कर रहे हैं या अपनी सलाह दे रहे हैं या सजेशन दे रहे हैं उस पर बार-बार संसदीय कार्य मंत्री जवाब न दें बल्कि मेरा आग्रह है कि सबकी बात सुन लें और उसके बाद इकट्ठा जवाब दे दें ।

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : I am on a limited question... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, please sit down. Shuklaji, still I have got some names left with me. First, let me decide, let the House also decide, whether we are going to take some more time for the discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : It has been decided yesterday.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yesterday, it has been decided that it would be taken up at 12 o'clock. Now, technically it is 1 o'clock. At this point of time we should have had the reply. Still there are Members who want to speak There are ten Members who want to speak. Accordingly if I allow ten Members to spgak... speak.. (Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Yesterday there were still ten Members who wanted to speak.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Names of ten Members are with me.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : यह बाद में जोड़ दिया होगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nobody has added any name. The Secretariat has not added any name. There are still seven or eight Members who want to speak, and whether it is seven Members or ten Members, it is the same. Are we going to give them extra time? Are we going to sit through lunch hour? Are we going to sit late in the evening? When should we have a reply? The question is, we should first conclude the discussion. Then only we can think about who will reply.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Whenever the Prime Minister is replying... ..(*Interruptions*).....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRAN: Mr. Jaipal Reddy, let us first decide. Let me put the things in order. Then, you can put in whatever your demand is. First, shall we finish the speeches of ten Members?

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Madam, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs was replying to a very important question

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He can reply. Are we tryng... (*Interruptions*)...Listen.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : There are other questions also.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. I will allow him to reply. No problem. Home Minister Sahib can reply. The Parliamentary Affairs Minister can reply. The Prime Minister can reply or anybody can reply. But the question is, can the reply be before the debate is over or shall I open a new debate before the speeches of ten Members who are listed here? Mr. Mehta was making so many complaints. I think, he has walked out of anger. Mr. Kohli is here. He has raised a point of order.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ (Haryana): Madam, I am also on a point of order

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your name is not here in the list. I am not on that subject. Dr. Dutta's name is here. What can I do?

SHHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam I submit, let the discussion, go on Madam suggest that the discussion can go on because the Prime Minister cannot come immediately since he has to reply to the debate on Defence. Meanwhile the discussion here can go on. He can come in the evening and reply. Now, he cannot come here. We are prepared to wait for him. Let the discussion go on Let the Members speak on this matter. There are still seven or eight Membes who want to speak on this matter. Let them speak. The Prime Minister can reply in the evening. We are prepared to wait because this is a very important matter.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, I am suggesting... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: We feel we many have things to ask of him. I am

sorry to say that the hon. Leader of the House may not be able to reply...(*Interruptions*)

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): Madam,... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants to respond. Let him speak.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Madam, on this particular issue... (*Interruptions*)... since constantly a reference was made to what was decided in the Chamber of the Chairman, I have to remind all the hon. Members about the BAC also. The BAC has also taken a decision, in the presence of the Chairman, that four hours will be devoted for this discussion. We have already taken about five hours.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And thirty minutes.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Five hours and thirty minutes. We have already exceeded the time-limit given to us. That is why I would request you, in order to finish the debate within the stipulated time, to keep it at the minimum and see that we are able to finish it within an hour or so.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Madam, my point is,...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are starting a new discussion.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: I am only requesting the hon. Minister looking after Parliamentary Affairs to kindly consider the opinion of the entire Opposition. The Prime Minister is not one among equals. He is the leader of the team. The hon. Minister of Home Affairs and the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs are within their right to speak for the Government on the floor of the House. There is no difference on that. But the point is, many questions have cropped up and specifically, in the background of one particular Cabinet Minister making a statement outside Parliament on a very sensitive issue saying that there should be a war. This statement of the Minister of Railways is outrageous. If it is correct, if the statement of the Minister of Railways... (*Interruptions*).....

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We cannot function like this. If every point of order... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: If the statement is correct, it is an outrageous statement which is unprecedented and unheard of and there should be no second opinion about condemning it. But the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs cannot dissociate himself. He is on a par with him. Only the leader of the team, only the captain of the team, only the Prime Minister, is competent to dispel the doubt lingering in our minds about the statement that has been issued. Therefore, Madam, in the fitness of things, let as not waste our time; let us appeal to the hon Prime Minister; and let us convey our appeal through the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Let him tell us when he is in a position to come. We are ready to sit overnight in order to listen to him because there have been many important issues raised which cannot be tackled by any other person. About Mr. Chavan's intervention, it is welcome. I would not mind if he even replies. But the intervention of the Prime Minister on the crucial issues that have cropped up is very important. And we shall always feel agitated if he does not come to this House now. We shall always feel that this House has become almost a secondary Chamber. This House has almost become a secondary Chamber, not a second Chamber. Therefore, I request that the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs may make the position clear to this House.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : मैडम, एक मिनट ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, I am on a point of order.

उपसभापति: : अभी कितनी दफा सब लोग प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर पर बोलेंगे ।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : मैडम, मैं एक मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा ।

. . . (**व्यवधान**) . . .

श्रीमती कमला सिंहा (बिहार) : मैडम, हम लोगों की तरफ तो आप देखती ही नहीं हैं । . . . (**व्यवधान**) . मैडम, हम लोगों की तरफ भी तो थोड़ा देख लिया कीजिए ।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : मैडम, अभी संसदीय कार्य मंत्री जी ने . . . (**व्यवधान**) .

उपसभापति : अभी मैं सारे हाऊस को क्या यही बोलती रहूंगी दिनभर? डिस्कशन फिर से शुरू हो जाएगा कि कौन जवाब दे, कौन जवाब न दे ।

Let us discuss it under a motion proper. (*Interruptions*). Short duration discussion. (*Interruptions*). Really we are making a mockery of parliamentary democracy. You request the Prime Minister. If one requests from each party, it is more than enough. I think more than two or three people from each party have requested many times. You do not have to keep on repeating it. You are taking the time of the House. In this time, you can contribute something worthwhile, instead of saying the same thing that the Prime Minister should come. It is the same thing. The Minister should go and convey. He doesn't want to repeat it ten times because you are repeating it ten times.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : नहीं मैडम, संसदीय कार्यमंत्री जी ने इस सदन को कंस्यूज करने की कोशिश की है । मैं विद्या चरण शुक्ल और चव्हाण साहब की इज्जत करता हूं । जाफर शरीफ जी के बयान पर जब सदस्यों ने ऐतराज किया कि अब चव्हाण साहब कम्पटेंट नहीं हैं इस बयान के बाद यह जवाब दें, प्रधान मंत्री जी आएं । तो संसदीय कार्यमंत्री जी ने कहा कि सरकार की तरफ से सदन में कोई भी जवाब दे सकता है, किसी की जिम्मेदारी लेकर दे सकता है । आज तमिलनाडु में रेल एक्सीडेंट हो गया है जिसमें 60 से ज्यादा लोग मरे हैं । अगर रेल मंत्री यहां नहीं हैं तो वह गृह मंत्री को या संसदीय कार्यमंत्री को अधिकृत कर सकते हैं कि हमारी तरफ से जवाब आप दे सकते हैं, बयान आप दे सकते हैं । इतना तक तो जिम्मेदारी हुआ करती है । लेकिन इतने बड़े नाजुक मुद्दे पर और केबिनेट का एक मिनिस्टर दूरदराज बैठकर अखबार के जरिए संदेश भेज दे और इस सदन के सदस्य जान जाएं कि अब पाकिस्तान के ऊपर हमला करने के अलावा कोई रास्ता नहीं है तो यह एक गंभीर स्थिति हो जाती है । इस पर गृह मंत्री संसदीय कार्य मंत्री कम्पटेंट नहीं होते जवाब देने के लिए और कल तक जो बहस हुई थी उसका संदर्भ ही बदल गया जाफर शरीफ साहब के इस बयान के बाद । बार-बार चव्हाण साहब कहते हैं, मैं कल भी बोल चुका था कि वे ही जवाब दूंगा । लेकिन अब वह स्थिति नहीं रही है । जब एक मंत्री ने बयान दे दिया, तो कल की बात का संदर्भ ही बदल गया । अब प्रधान मंत्री के अलावा कोई सक्षम नहीं होता कि इस मुद्दे पर जवाब दे । इसलिए मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि चव्हाण साहब बोलें उनकी इज्जत है गृह मंत्री हैं । लेकिन यह विभाग उनके हाथ में नहीं है, उनसे छीन लिया गया है । वे बोलें, उन्होंने नोट तैयार किया है । लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जी अंत में जवाब देने के लिए आएं । राज्य सभा के साथ सौतेला व्यवहार न किया जाए, संसदीय कार्यमंत्री से मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा । लोक सभा में जवाब देने के लिए प्रधान मंत्री के पास में वक्त है और राज्य सभा के साथ सौतेला व्यवहार प्रधान मंत्री जी करें, यह अपमानपूर्ण माना जाएगा ।

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता : मैडम. . . . (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam,

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Madam, when are you calling me?

उपसभापति : देखिए, वह नाराज हो रहे हैं ।

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता : एक गलतफहमी हमें दूर करना है । पहली बात तो यह है

कि हम हिन्दी में बोलेंगे तो जरा अच्छी तरह से समझेंगे आप लोग । मेरा बात यह है कि आप जो चर्चा कर रहे हैं कि प्राईम मिनिस्टर जवाब दें या न दें, इससे अलग मेरा दूसरा मुद्दा है ।

SHR IS. JAIPAL REDDY: We have always been able to follow his Hindi better than his English.

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता : मेरा मुद्दा यह है कि कल शाम को हाऊस में जो एनोनिमसली तय किया गया था कि अभी भी बहस जारी रहेगी । कुछ 7–8 वक्ता इस पर बोलने वाले हैं । अब वह बात तो आपने उठाई नहीं । प्राईम मिनिस्टर बोलें या न बोलें, यह तो बाद में सवाल आता है। लेकिन आप लोग अगर बोल लें, उसके बाद प्राईम मिनिस्टर जवाब दें या गृह मंत्री जवाब दें , वह बहस हो सकती है। परन्तु बीच में ही आपने ऐसा करके हमारा जो अधिकार था, आठ वक्ताओं के बोलने का . . . (**व्यवधान**) नहीं–नहीं, कहां रहा ?

बात ऐसी है कि पहले उनको आप एलाऊ कीजिए, फिर बाद में ही बहस कीजिए कि यह जवाब कौन देगा । अभी से उस पर बहस शुरू कर दी है । अब 1–15 बज गया है । . . . (**व्यवधान**) प्राईम मिनिस्टर जवाब दें या होम मिनिस्टर, कल से यह बात हो रही है, आज भी यह बात हो रही है । हिन्दुस्तान के बड़े-बड़े नेता इधर बैठे है । छोटी सी बात पर इतनी बड़ी गभीर चर्चा करके इसका मामला सुलझा नहीं सके । अब भी कब सुधरेगा मुझे मालूम नहीं ।

He will say, "You can go on discussing. The Home Minister will reply." We will say, "The Prime Minister should reply." How long are we going to discuss this issue?

उपसभापति : मेहता जी, आप जरा स्थान ग्रहण करिए । मैं हिन्दी में बोल रही हूं । आप बैठिए ।

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता : कल के जो वक्ता हैं, उनको बोलने की इजाजत दीजिए ।

उपसभापति : आप बैठिए, आप जब हर गले गए थे, मैंने यही बात कही थी । आप रिकार्ड देख लीजिए । मैंने यही कहा था और आपका भी नाम लिया था कि सब लोग जो बोलने वाले हैं पहले वह भाषण करल, उसके बाद जवाब की बात आएगी । आप सुन रहे है या नहीं सुन रहे हैं ? क्या कहा मैंने ? आप बाहर चले जाते हैं, आप हाऊस में इधर-उधर बात करते हैं, फिर आप सबसे शिकायत करते हैं । आपके बारे में मैंने रेफर किया ।

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता : अगर शिकायत आपको लगी तो, मैं चाहता हूं कि न लगे ।

उपसभापति : मेहता जी, शिकायत तो मैम्बर्स से हो रही है । वे झगड़ा कर रहे हैं, मैं थोड़ी ही कर रही हूं ? मैं तो चाह रही हूं कि बातचीत शुरू हो जाए। I better call Shri B. B. Dutta.

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा : मैडम, झगड़ा पार्लियामेंटरी है क्या ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, Mr. Shukla came out with one statement. Can a statemetn made by one Cabinet Minister be contradicted or clarifide by another Cabinet Minister? Is that correct? That is the point of order. A statement... (Interruptions). Shukla-ji is here. He is the senior-most Member of Parliament. He does not need anybody's assistance. We, in fact, need his assistance. My simple point is this. I would like to know whether a statement made by a Cabinet Minister can be authoritatively contradicted by another Cabinet Minister. In my view it is not possible. The position taken by Mr. Shukla is totally untenable. A position taken by a Cabinet Minister can be contradicted officially and authoritatively only by the Prime Minister.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Madam, that is the point I raised. I want your ruling. (Interruptions).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam, here is a case which is being built by Shri Murli Manohar Joshi and others. They said that Mr. Jaffer Sharief has declared a war against Pakistan. It is not so.

Mr. Jaffer Sharief, on behalf of the Government, has never declared a war against the Government of Pakistan. He has only expressed his opinion. (Interruptions). He has given his opinion. Only on hte basis... (*Interruptions*). Please hear me. (Interruptions). What he said was that Pakistan was abetting and encouraging terrorist activities in Kashmir and Punjab. Mr. Jaffer Sharief has expressed an pinion. He has not declared any war. He has only said that Pakistan is responsible. (*Interruptions*). On that basis... (*Interruptions*). They are unnecessarily creating a problem for nothing. (*Interruptions*). He has expressed his opinion.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, we would like to know one thing. If a Cabinet Minister makes a statement, when should we take it as an authoritative statement and when should we take it as an opinion? (Interruptions). He has talked about TADA also. You read the entire statement. (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me hear the other side.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, there seems to be a certain amount of confusion and lontradiction in the minds of my frieds on the other side. On the one hand, they have been stressing on the ioncept of collect ve responsibility and on the other hand, with the same mind, they have be n insisting that the Prime Minister should come and reply over here. Madam, what has arisen today? This dispute is over a statement which has appeared in the newspapers, alleged to have been made by a particular Minister from the Cabinet. Now, the House is actually discussing that particular subject since ye terday and right now we should have been doing that. Madam, the hon. Home Minister has been authorised by the Government to speak on the subject and reply to it which also means that it is the Government's view or position as far as this issue is concerned. I would request the hon. Members to listen to what the hon. Home Minister says. He is going to say something on the floor of the House, not something which has appeared in the newspapers. I don't know whether any of my friends has taken pains to verify from that Minister whether he has actually made that statement. In any case, the Government's position will be made clear. The position of the Government will be clarified by the hon. Home Minister. If you are not satisfied, you can seek clarifications later on. I don't think there is any reason to unnecessarily continue this dispute. As my hon. friend, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta, has said, after all the Prime Minister is *primus inter paras*. He is the first among equals. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: The Prime Minister is the captain of the team...(Interruptions)... The Ministers are appointed on the prerogative of the Prime Minister ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mr. Kishore Chandra Deo, the Prime Minister is the concerned Minister in this case. That is the primary basis on which we are making this demand ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: Mr. Jaipal Reddy, according to Harold Laski and Ivor Jennings, the Prime Minister is first among equals, he is primus inter paras. When you are talking of joint responsibility, the Home Minister is equally responsible. He is authorised to reply. So, listen to him... (*Interruptions*)... Thank you ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: We never talked of joint responsibility on this issue. Mr. Shukla made a statement. Then the question arose. Mr. Jaffer Sharief made a statement outside. Do they own it? That was the question which we were asking. They are not prepared to answer this question.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: That is something which appeared in the newspapers. Listen to what the Home Minister has to say ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Since when has Mr. Kishore Chandar Deo become the spokesman of the Congress party?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has a right to speak as a Member... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO :I also know the procedure. I am speaking about the procedure of the Parliament. I am speaking about the functioning of the Parliament ...(*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Is he speaking on behalf of the Government?... *(Interruptions)*... You do not have any right ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Sinha... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: Madam, there are certain procedures which are followed in the Parliament... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD (Andhra Pradesh): Madam ...*(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Giri Prasad, I have not allowed you. Mrs. Sinha, it is beside the point. Mr. Deo has as much right to speak in this House as you have. To object to his making his viewpoint is I don't think in keeping with the spirit of the Parliamentary democracy. If he is speaking on behalf of his party, he is doing so in his right. He has a right to speak. He can speak... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: He cannot speak on behalf of the Home Minister. Can he do that?

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: Please read the transcript and try to understand what I said ... *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He can give his viewpoint. Why are you objecting to it? I have been saying since morning that we should be tolerant. Learn something from me. I am listening to everybody and I am not saying a word. Just keep quiet ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: It is very difficult for us to learn from you... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: Madam, is the Rajya Sabha inferior to the Lok Sabha? ...(Interruptions)... The Prime Minister is not prepared to reply here. No commitment has been made from the Government's side. The Prime Minister i snot going to reply in this House. What does it mean?...(Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nobody is inferior to anybody. We are all supeiror...(Interruptions)...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: I had put a specific question to the Minister rof Parliamentary Affairs. Now you have allowed him to escape. I am sorry. Instead of learning from you, we are unlearning. We wanted to learn something from him and you have deprived us of it. We wanted to be educated and enlightened...(Interruptions)... Madam, will you call him...(Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He must be busy in the Lok Sabha...(Interruptions)...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: He was on his legs. Now you have allowed him to escape. He was responding to my question. You have deprived me of that chance of education and learning of which you are so serious and the House is also serious. Why should this be allowed?... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam, the entire House wants the Prime Minister to give the reply. Is he going to oblige us?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, please take the sense of the House whether the Prime Minister should give the reply or not.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: Madam, yesterday the Treasury Benches also

wanted the Prime Minister to reply. Mr. Fotedar said that the Prime Minister should reply.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: The whole House demands it. It is the sense of the House that the Prime Minister should reply...(Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order in the House...(Interruptions)... Please sit down. I understand how eager the Members are to listen to the Prime Minister. I can understand this. But you have read his reply in Lok Sabha. I am sure all the questions which you had asked or which might have been in your mind...(Interruptions)... Please listen to me...(Interruptions)...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, please don't refer to what happened in that House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't interrupt me. It is very irritating. If you don't want to listen to me, I will adjourn the House. I am very sorry that...(Interruptions)...

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Madam, you were talking about tolerance some time ago.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have tolerated you enough. I was trying.. (Interruptions)... I understand that you wanted to hear the Prime Minister. You have said that...(Interruptions)... I adjurn the House for lunch.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty-five minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-five minutes past two of the clock,

The Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Jaipalji, what is the inspiration to smile? Looking at you makes me smile and laugh... (Interruptions)... Sometimes the compulsions of job necessitate my getting angry. Now, I have a good news to give to the House. I think sometimes that kind of anger is good. The Home Minister has been very kind and helpful. He has spoken not only to the Prime Minister, considering the demand of the hon. Members of this House, to speak, but he has also requested the Speaker to delay the reply on Defence in Lok Sabha. So, the Prime Minister will come at 3 o'clock. Now, I have these names before me. I request the Members to speak in one or two words or to withdraw their names. You can speak till 3 o'clock.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : सदर साहिबा, मैं अपना नाम वापस लेता हूं ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Good gesture.

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): Nobody is following!...(Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Everybody should follow because I have to finish the discussion by 3 o'clock. We can't have the Prime Minister waiting here. Sikander Bakhtji, who will speak from your party? You please identify him.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : हमारी तरफ से कोहली साहब बोलेंगे ।

उपसभापति : कांग्रेस के दो है ।

Mr. Dutta, if you don't mind, please be brief. Please finish your speech within five minutes. I know that your knowledge and experience are good.

DR. B. B. DUTTA (Nominated): Madam, I will not go into the details, but I would like to make one point. While I join my hon. colleagues in Parliament in expressing ur solidarity with the people who have become the direct

victims in Charar-e-Sharief, the victim of that great tragedy, I would like to draw the attention of this august House to one very important aspect of what has happened, what is happening and what is likely to happen. Madam, there are some suggestions that we should have a proper response to such a grave challenge that we should have a proper policy that we don't have one. that we should have a Kashmir Policy, and all that. Now, whatever we want to have, we should first have an assessment of the forces that we are pitted against. What are the forces behind these happenings? During the course of the debate in this House, I find that all eye are glued to what is happening in Kashmir. The focus is in Kashmir only I want to draw the attention of the House that the forces which are active in Kashmir are not only operating in Kashmir, but they have opened another front in the North-East, where Law started they operating in the same way they started in Kashmir and Punjab. Madam, we should not be under the illusion that the kind of situation that we had in the North-East in the sixties and seventies is still prevailing there. There were and even today there are insurgencies, no doubt. But there is a metamorphosis in the whole situation and, I tell you, the ISI has established a very well-knit network. Training camps are being run for the ethnic groups. Tribals and non-tribals are recruited as trainees. The situation is fast developing where in not-too-distant future you may have to send a number of Army divisions to contain the situation. The topography and the terrain of the area are similar to that of Kashmir. A small number of people armed, well-financed, well-funded, well-trained with the backing of the State power from across the border can create havoc. Madam, against these forces we are operating in Kashmir. They have penetrated. These forces are sometimes visible and sometimes invisible. Sometimes we call them terrorists and sometimes we call them them militants. Sometimes we call them fundamentalists and we see them against a particular geography. But, these forces are now operating on a global basis across the border. It is a hydra-headed monster which has many arms and many channels. The are connected with drug mafias; they look like terrorists but we should not confuse them with ordinary terrorists. They are connected with militants and the agitationists crying for autonomy, but we should not confuse with them. That is why I want that a proper assessment of the enemy should be made and then only the right policy can come.

If we have to fight such formidable forces, the first requirement is this: That we, in India, have to see that there is no fundamentalism amongst us. If we are having fundamentalism in any plitical party or parties, if we are having fundamentalist thoughts in our familiar discussions and behavious at the village level, at the State level and national level, then we are not morally armed and morally equipped to fight this menace. I can tell you that the greatest antidote to these forces in India is the vision of a united, integrated, India with an open society and democratic society with socialist ethos. That is the anathema to these forces. It is those forces about which Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the greatest among Muslims in recent times, the most religious Muslim leader, said to our national leaders before partition, "You are throwing us into the hands of wolves." And it is those wolves who orgainse themselves as a tribe and it is they who entered in Kashmir in 1948 and it is that force against which we had to fight a war in 1965. It is that force which was taught a lesson in East Pakistan which wanted to eliminate the local cultural identity and their linguistic identity, wanting to Islamise them, make that land a citadel of fanatic Islam on the eastern side of the Inidan sub-continent. It is against that force the people of Bangladesh, inspired by the ideas of Nehru, Mahatma

Gandhi and Indiraji and other leaders.

Our democratic and secular values, achleved victory on that front. Today, if we abandon that path, we shall only help them. They want that we become communal, we become fundamentalist. That is what the fundamentalists operating in Kashmir want. We should not do it. If we want this menace to be fought out, we should, first of all, do this thing. The rest of it, Madam, is a matter of finding our strategy to fight them. We have to fight them diplomatally because they are operating from the human right platform, they are operating through various diplomatic channels, they have got friends across the internaitonal borders. They are a very formidable force.

One more thing I will tell you, Madam. This force which is operating in the sub-continent is not only operating inside India, but it is operating inside Pakistan also. It is the same force which could eliminate Zulfiquar Ali Bhutto, the father of the "Daughter of the East" who could not do anything because of our valiant fight against oppression in East Pakistan and who, under the pressure of military and fundamentalists is not able to speak her own mind. She is speaking other's language and she cannot be recognised because she is not her former self. This is a very dangerous force operating in this subcontinent. Lately, what I have heard is that they are also trying to operate from Sri Lanka. They are present with their LTTE connections. They are trying to start so that India can stretch her energy everywhere. Madam, if we are to fihgt such a force, we have to have the proper understanding of the situation. It is not merely Kashmir. (*Time Bell ringhs*). Just a a minute, Madam. The other day, the Harkat-ul-Ansar— nobdy has mentioned that — has threatened that they would strike at our cities. This organisation is a newly formed organisation, only one-and-a-half year back this came into existence. No Kashmiris are there in this organisation. It is composed of foreign elements, from our coasting borders, mostly from Pakistan. How can they carry out their threat? I am telling you that they are able to carry out their threat because they have spread their tantacies into the heart of India, not only in Kashmir, but in other plaecs also. They can strike terror. We should be very cautious when we speak. We should not try to weaken our position. Madam, these are some of the forces which are operating throughout the sub-continent, not only in Kashmir, but also in the North-East, in Southern India and everywhere. So, I want a proper apreciation of the situation to be made and then only a policy can be framed and a strategy can be worked out. What Mr. Jagmohan has said, whatever Mrs. Chowdhury has said whatever Dr. Biplab Dasgupta has said and he has criticised some of the points— there is substance in their points. But, we should not speak in a manner as if we are responsible for making the Kashmiris anti-Indians. Kashmiris have not still become anti-Indians. They are angry, agitated and are irritated. They are not participating in these things. What ever youths from Kashmir have joined, they have joined under force. They are afraid. They have joined under force because their oppression is like this. They have made the administration infructuous. They make the Government paralytic and then people find that there is no administration. When they give a call for strike, nobody opposes them because they are afraid of them. People only listen to them because they have no other way. That is what they are doing in Kashmir and the North-East. We should properly

assess the situation because it is a very great challenge to us. Keeping in view the time factor, I would not take any more of your time. Thank you, Madam.

उपसभापति : श्री ओ. पी. कोहली। टाइम का ध्यान रखिएगा, कोहली जी।

श्री ओ०पी० कोहली (दिल्ली) : महोदया, जिन लोगों ने चरार-ए-शरीफ दरगाह को जलाकर राख करना था, उन्होंने दरगाह को जलाकर राख कर दिया। बहस भी उस पर हो चुकी लोक सभा में और राज्य सभा में भी पूरी हो जाएगी, विपक्ष ने प्रधान मंत्री से इस्तीफे की भी मांग कर ली और सत्ता पक्ष की तरफ से जिस किस्म का रेस्पॉन्स आना था वह भी आ लिया, लेकिन तन सबके बावजूद भी कुछ बातें इससे से साफ उभर कर आती हैं। एक बात, यह कि सरकार विफल रही है। यह उसकी राजनैतिक विफलता भी है, नागरिक प्रशासन की विफलता भी है और सरकार जिसको अपनी रणनीति या स्ट्रैटजी कहती रही है, उस रणनीति की भी विफलता है। सरकार की सफलता तब मानी जाती, जब वह स्थिति को बिगड़ने न देती और कुछ प्रिवेंटिव मैजर्स ऐसे अपनाती, जिससे कि इस पवित्र दरगाह को जलाकर खाक करने से रोका जा सकता। सरकार वह नहीं कर पाई और अब सरकार जो दलीलें देती है वह बड़ी लचर दलीलें हैं कि वह इलाका बड़ा कन्जस्टेड इलाका था, वह दरगाह तो लकड़ी की बनी हुई थी, बड़ा संवेदनशील स्थान था, हम कुछ कार्यवाही करते तो उससे कुछ नुकसान पहुंच सकता था, लोगों की भावनाओं को चोट पहुंच सकती थी। यह सारी दलीलें जो सरकार दे रही है अपनी विफलता को छिपाने के लिए, यह कतई कन्विन्सिंग नहीं लगती, यह लोगों के गले नहीं उतरती।

महोदया, इसमें कुछ सवाल उठते हैं कि सरकार इन मामलों में प्रिवेंटिव मैजर्स क्यों नहीं ले सकी? दरगाह में आतंकवादी इकट्ठा होते रहे, सरकार देखती रही। आतंकवादी हथियार इकट्ठा करते रहे, सरकार देखती रही। गोला बारूद वहां इकट्ठा होता रहा, सरकार देखती रही। आतंकवादी सारी सुरंगें बिछाते रहे, परिष्कृत विस्फोटक लगाते रहे, सरकार देखती रही। उन्होंने दरगाह जलाने का अपना मनसूबा जाहिर किया, सरकार देखती रही। सरकार को यह जानकारी होते हुए भी कि आतंकवादी इस सीमा तक जा सकते हैं, उन्होंने अपनी मंशा को छिपाया नहीं बल्कि जाहिर किया, सरकार मूकदर्शक बनी रही। ट्रांसमीटर से संदेश सीमा के परली ओर भेजे जाते रहे, सरकार को जानकारी थी, सरकार मूकदर्शक बनी रही। मस्त गुल सब कुछ काम करके वहां से भाग गया, सरकार मूकदर्शक बनी रही। ये सब सवाल एक सवाल को उठाते हैं कि सरकार प्रिवेंटिव मैजर्स लेने में क्यों विफल रही, प्रिवेंटिव मैजर्स क्यों नहीं लिए गए?

हम पाकिस्तान को दोष देते हैं कि वह हमारे खिलाफ दुष्प्रचार कर रहा है। पाकिस्तान तो हमारा शत्रु देश है, दुष्प्रचार करेगा ही। इस प्रकार के मोर्चे पर हम पाकिस्तान से क्यों मार खा रहे हैं? क्यों नहीं हम अपना प्रचार ज्यादा प्रभावी बनाते जिससे कि हमारा पक्ष दुनिया के सामने रखा जा सके।

सरकार अपनी पीठ बहुत थप-थपाती है कि वह जम्मू-कश्मीर की स्थिति से निबटने के लिए एक बहुत बढ़िया कश्मीर नीति अपनाए हुए है। मेरा यह कहना है कि सरकार के पास कश्मीर के मामले में कोई नीति है ही नहीं, अगर नीति है तो वह एकदम दोषपूर्ण, त्रुटिपूर्ण, बेमायनी और विफल नीति है। इसलिए जरूरी है कि सरकार कश्मीर के बारे में एक सुसंगत, सकारात्मक और व्यावहारिक नीति का निर्माण करे तथा उसका निर्माण ही न करे, उसके बारे में देश में एकमत बनाने का भी प्रयत्न करे।

महोदया, जिस प्रशासन के बल पर हम वहां स्थिति को सामान्य करना चाहते हैं, उस प्रशासन में तो ऊपर से नीचे तक आतंकवादी तत्व घुसे हुए हैं। अगर आतंक-

वादी तत्व न घुसे होते तो एक पुलिस अधिकारी के यहां मस्त गुल का ठहरना, 26 जनवरी को राज्यपाल की पब्लिक मीटिंग में बम-विस्फोट हो जाना और उनका बाल-बाल बचना, यह कैसे संभव हो सकता है ? इसलिए वहां की स्थिति का तकाजा है कि प्रशासन का पुनर्गठन किया जाए, उसे सुधारा जाए ।

एक बात की ओर मैं और इशारा करना चाहता हूं और वह यह है कि चरार-ए-शरीफ की दरगाह जलने के बाद . . (**समय की घंटी**) . . . कश्मीर के लोगों को जिनपर *गुस्सा आना चाहिए था---गुस्सा आना चाहिए* था पाकिस्तान पर, गुस्सा आना चाहिए था आतंकवादियों पर, लेकिन वहां क्या हो रहा है ? हिन्दुओं के मंदिर जलाए जा रहे हैं। डोडा में एक ही परिवार के 8 लोगों की हत्या कर दी गई । सेना और पुलिस के खिलाफ प्रदर्शन हो रहे हैं, पथराव हो रहा है। इसका अर्थ है कि हम कश्मीर के लोगों को भी ठीक तरीके से यह नहीं समझा पा रहे कि चरार-ए-शरीफ की दरगाह को जलाने के लिए दोषी कौन है, कौन दोषी नहीं है ।

महोदया, एक बहुत चिंता का विषय यह है कि इस सारे विवाद में सरकार की गलत रणनीति ने, सरकार की गलत हैंडलिंग ने हमारी सेना को विवाद में खींच लिया है। हिन्दुस्तान की सेना, जो दुनिया की आलीशान सेना है, उसकी प्रतिष्ठा भी विवाद में घिर गई है। 15 तारीख, सोमवार के "बिजनेस स्टेंडर्ड" में एक लेख है :--

"Tale of Government ineptness from the beginning to the end."

इसमें शुरू से लेकर आखिर तक सेना के बारे में ऐसी-ऐसी बातें कही गई हैं और उस पर जिम्मेदारी लादी गई हैं। अगर सरकार इन चीजों को क्लेरिफाई नहीं करती है तो ये बातें हमारे खिलाफ विदेशी शक्तियां इस्तेमाल कर सकती हैं, इसलिए इसका जवाब आना चाहिए ।

मैं एक आखिरी बात का जिक्र और करना चाहता हूं। अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी इस सदन में आएंगे । लोक सभा में उन्होंने कल जवाब देते हुए कश्मीर में चुनाव कराने की बात फिर एक बार जोर से कही है। मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूं आपके माध्यम से कि कश्मीर में चुनाव कराए जाएं या न कराए जाएं, यह वहां की स्थिति का यथार्थ और ऑब्जेक्टिव आकलन करके तय किया जाए । क्योंकि चरार-ए-शरीफ की दरगाह को आतंकवादियों ने फूंक दिया है इसलिए उसके रिएक्शन में, उसकी प्रतिक्रिया में हम यह कहें कि अब तो इसका जवाब यह हो सकता है कि हम वहां पर चुनाव कराएंगे, *चाहे वहां की परिस्थिति चुनाव कराने के* अनुकूल हो या न हो, मेरा निवेदन है आपके माध्यम से कि कश्मीर में चुनाव कराने का निर्णय चरार-ए-शरीफ की दरगाह को फूंकने का जो कदम आतंकवादियों ने उठाया है प्रतिक्रिया में न लिया जाए बल्कि शांत मन से स्थिति का यथार्थ आकलन करके फैसला किया जाए । . . (**समय की घंटी**) . . अगर चुनाव कराने की बात सरकार जुलाई में सोचती है तो क्या वहां पर ऐसा वातावरण है कि पोलिटिकल पार्टीज वहां पर अपनी जन-सभाएं कर सकें, अपनी सामान्य राजनीतिक गतिविधियां चला सकें, लोगों तक अपनी बात पहुंचा सकें ? कश्मीर में चुनाव कराना एक बहुत बड़ा जुआ होगा। अगर आतंकवादियों के डर से लोग घरों से नहीं निकलेंगे अगर मुट्ठीभर लोग ही चुनाव में भाग लेंगे तो चुनाव की विश्वसनीयता पर ही प्रश्न-चिन्ह लग जाएगा । यह भी खतरा है कि सारे चुनाव को आतंकवादी कंट्रोल कर लें और आतंकवादियों के द्वारा नियंत्रित चुनाव के बाद उनमें से जो सरकार बने वह भी कहीं आतंकवादियों द्वारा नियंत्रित सरकार न हो और ऐसी स्थिति में कश्मीर के साथ देश को एक ओर अखंड रखना और भी मुश्किल हो जाएगा ।

इसके साथ ही जुड़ा हुआ सवाल यह है कि कश्मीर के जो . . . (**व्यवधान**) . . . . (**समय की घंटी**)

मैं समाप्त करने जा रहा हूं महोदया।

कश्मीर के जो तीन लाख से भी अधिक हिन्दू विस्थापित है, वह मतदान में कैसे भाग लेंगे । इसको सुनिश्चित करना भी आवश्यक है । इसलिए जरूरत इस बात की है कि चुनाव से पूर्व वहां पर शांति की पहल की जाए । प्रतिक्रिया में चुनाव करवाने का निर्णय न किया जाए । साफ मन से यथार्थ स्थिति का आकलन करके फैसला किया जाए, मतदाता सूचियों का संशोधन किया जाए । वहां की आज तो हालत यह है कि गत जनवरी में सुरक्षा बलों पर 157 बार हमले हुए । . . . (घंटी) . . गणतंत्र दिवस पर जम्मू में बम विस्फोट हुआ । मंढेर के निकट दिसम्बर 94 में सुरंगों का विस्फोट हुआ जिसमें 11 सैनिकों की मौके पर मृत्यु हुई ।

उपसभापति : बैठिए ।

श्री ओ. पी. कोहली : गत फरवरी के पहले हफ्ते में अक्तूबर में एक साथ कई धमाके हुए । ऐसी हालत में महोदया, वहां चुनाव कैसे संभव है । इसलिए मेरा आपसे फिर एक निवेदन यह है कि चुनाव का निर्णय शांत चित्त से किया जाए । यह जुआ, यह गैम्बल वहां न खेला जाए, देश के भविष्य के साथ खिलवाड़ न किया जाए, यह बात मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूं ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nilotpal Basu, Please be brief. On your request, the Prime Minister is coming. Let us keep that in mind and be brief.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, at the very outset, I would like to point out that there has been a general call here to evolve a national consensus on tackling the situaion which has come about as a fall-out of the very very disturbing eve which has taken place in Charar-e-Sarief.

We are discussing all this in an atmosphere of national anguish, national dishonour and national mourning. It is a refreshing change to her all this talk about evolving a national consensus. I say this because, earlier, when the Government was in a minority, they were talking about consensus. But, for the last few months or few years, after the Government got the majority, they gave up this talk of consensus.

Now, the point is, there has to be a consensus. We agree on that. But the call for consensus would have been more credible had this call come at an earlier point of time. There has been a time-lag between the siege of the Charar-e-Sharief sharine by the militants and the call that is being issued by the Government and the ruling party Members in this House, by speaker after speaker. There has been a time-lag of three months. I would like to know from the Government: What efforts were being made by the Government to evolve a consensus in this three-month period? This question becomes more important because even on Wednesday, a day before this incident had happened, when a discussion was taking place in this House and when the Home Minister was reacting, we were not informed of the gravity of the situation that had developed in Charar-e-Sharief.

The second point is that the consensus would have to be on the basis of a credible campaign that India, as a nation, would have to undertake. A point, was made by my friend, Mr. Salim, in the morning, in the course of the Question Hour, that when we were seeing that Radio Pakistan, the media in Pakistan, and the Western media were dishing out all kinds of adverse propaganda and their kind of version on the developments, we were not able to put across a credible alternative idea in our media. He mentioned as to how, in spite of the earlier announcement, Doordarshan failed to show the televised reporting of thte developments in Charar-e-Sharief. The point is, the consensus would have to be on a credible, on as acceptable, version of the incident, which was not forthtiming from the Government.

The third point I would like to make is: It is not by a mere accident that

the destruction of the Charar-e-Sharief shrine has taken place. Charer-e-Sharief represents the composite and
3 P.M. plural culture of Indian tradition and Indian history. It is, therefore, the pirme target of the fundamentalist elements. Now, the point is that the national consensus that has to evolve, has to take into consideration that we can strengthen whatever composite culture and whatever plural culture is there in the Indian traditions. Again, we cannot evolve a national consensus, taking a position that the secular and diverse nature of the Indian society and Indian policy cannot be evolved.

The fourth point that I would like to make, Madam, is that the confused nature of the Government's response from the beginning on the Kashmir situation was evident from the fact that they had confused over the two terms. "political process" and "holding of elections." Holding of elections is a part of the political process, and not the whole of it. Now, the point is that election has to come as a culmination of the political process, about which there was no meaningful initiative. There was no discussion on the part of the Government really to bring in forces across the table where some kind of ground rules for evolving such a political process could be evolved.

Finally, Madam, the Government, the people and all the political forces must speak with one voice. A kind of squabbling has been going on in the Government. One Minister says something, and another Minister says something else. We cannot protect our shrines. We cannot protect our customs. One Minister goes on saying that now our agenda is to occupy the Pak-occupied Kashmir. I do not to go into what the Prime Minister spoke on the 15th of August, but the point is that we should not appear to be infantile adventurers to the whole comity of nations. We should say somethnig which we can defend. Otherwise if we talk such nonsense, our stock will only go down before the people of the world. There is the latest remark of Mr. Jaffer Sharief. I do not know whether it is true, but, if it is true, it is outrageous. On the one hand, we are complaining, and we have every right to complain, that Pakistan is behaving like a terrorist State and we are trying to mobilse world opinion against Pakistan and we are pressing that there should be a peaceful dialogue to settle the Kashmir question. On the other hand, we talk like jingoist war-mongers. Will that kind of a sentiment and that kind of an attitude be the basis for a national consensus? If that be so, I, on behalf of my party, would like to say that we cannot share such a perception. We think that it is not yet too late. We can still take steps, initiatives, to evolve a naional consensus. The commitment that the Prime Minister has made in reply to the debate on the President's Address of announcing a package for Kashmir, can become the core of such a process.

With this, I thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venkatraman, again, be brief.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN (Tamil Nadu): It so happens, Madam, that every time I speak, there is time-constraint.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every time it happens ....

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Madam, I will try to be brief.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your party has taken more time.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Madam, I join hands with the hon. Members, who have expressed their anguish over the barbarous act of the mercenaries in burning the 600-year old Charar-e-Sharief Shrine in Kashmir.

Yesterday, the whole day we had a discussion on this. Points and counterpoints have been thrown up by the Trea-

sury Benches as well as the Opposition. One point caught my eyes and my feeling is that we had started from the Babri Masjid, that that was only the beginning and that this was the second incident in which we came to this shrine.

I want to submit that this shows that we are not united and that we are a divided house. Intolerance is not preached by any religion. As a matter of fact, tolerance is the watch word of all religions. What we have made by demolishing the Babri Masjid is that we are intolerant towards another religion. Here also we find now that under the fanatic idealism we want to demolish the Indian culture and throw mud on the people. So, they want to threaten us by way of employing foreign mercenaries.

Madam, I want to submit a few points for a deep thinking by this House. I think the Prime Minister will answer this point.

It has been admitted by the Home Secretary that the Government had learnt in December last that the militants had started going to the shrine disguised as pilgrims and they were holding in the shrine to further their end. The incident took place in May. They had entered the shrine to the knowledge of the Government in December, 1994. So, four months have passed. They had been preparing, preparing and preparing. What was this Government doing? My point is that any amount of explanation will not absolve them of their responsibility and accountability.

Another aspect is that there was an irrefutable evidence in support of the strategy of these people. The evidence is there that they wanted to incite the religious sentiments of the people. Through their secret agency they had this information also. In that context is it not reasonable on the part of the Opposition to ask the people, who are at the helm of affairs, ruling the country, as to what their action is and what the reason for their inaction is. It is really surprising to see why when had the information from Decemcer itself andn the incident has taken place in May, why you were keeping silent. Why no action was taken to prevent any such possibility?

On the other hand, the fact remain that the State Government had passed on information to the mercenaries that they would be allowed a safe passage if they left they shrine. That also raises a reasonable doubt in the mind of all reasonable persons as to why you should pass on such an information, when you know full well that they were out to do some mischief. Why should you ask them that you will give them a safe passage if they go away? Is that the way to tackle such a problem? Were five months not eonugh for you to make arrangements to enter the shrine and pump them out without any mischief having been caused? You had given them sufficient time and they gathered strength. Therefore, the main thing is that the Prime Minister last week itself had said that they were in the know of things as to what was happening in Kashmir. He was apprised of the facts every minute. In such an event what made this Government become a mute observer? Moreover, they kept the army 1.5 kilometres away. That is also a surprising thing in this case. Therefore, the Opposoition has been demanding that the best solution is that the Prime Minister should resign.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: The crucial point in the entire debate, according to my modest opinion, is that it is Pakistan which is responsible for the burning down of the Charar-e-Sharif. On the one hand, to say that Pakistan did it and on the other, to say the Government of India is equally responsible, I think, are contradictory statements. A person who commits a crime and the person who suffers a crime, if both are to be put on an equal footing.

I do not know why intelligent people do not understand the logic. But sometimes they do it, not for the national cause, but for the party's cause. Let up be clear whether this is a national issue or a party issue. If it is a national issue, then, Pakistan has to be condemned. It was a blackmail on their part to burn the Charar-e-Sharief shrine, not to hold elections in Jammu and Kashmir. Now to go back on the issue of elections, not to hold the elections will further give them the strength to bully India. They will burn more Charar-e-Shariefs and more temples. So, the whole debate yesterday that was going on was more confusing. The basic issue is whether Pakistan is responsible or whether Mrs. Bhutto is responsible or not is another matter. Let us pin it down to that point that it is Pakistan which is responsible for this incident. We should create a world opinion for the simple reason that one day might come when we shall have to pursue the hardcore leaders and mercenaries inside their borders, if it is necessary. I am not talking of a war. But they are waging a low-intensity war against us. I would like to know what your reply is going to be. Should we just protest? Are we to have a debate on how the Rao Government has failed? Their failures are many. I never defended them on so many accounts. The Government has failed on various issues. But here our national duty is this, when we stand up unitedly, we should not raise a secondary issue. We must fight out Pakistan diplomatically. If necessary, other options should not b eavoided. When the refugees came to India from Bangladesh, how we had reacted? The reaction that was given to them had stirred them. Just now, Dr. Dutta was mentioning that in the North-East, Pakistanis are having a base. They are united with the LTTE people. They are encircled by them. Our response is only inner-through inner-party fightings and intra-party fightings. They are not reacting to it as a national issue. That is the reason why India is not rising to the level to which it should have risen. I strongly advocate holding elections. The Prime Minister is absolutely right in holding elections. We will also try to help in holding elections smoothly. But if they do not want, how can we help them? Should we stop holding elections? Then their design will be successful. So, let us not fall into their trap for this reason.

Sir, I would like to say that...*(Interruptions)*...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Don't address the Chair as "Sir". But say "Madam Deputy Chairman".

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: am sorry, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Never mind, it is all right.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, he is addressing the Prime Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is addressing me, if I am right. He comes under the 'Other Group'. He is from Telugu Desam-I.

DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR (Andhra Pradesh): Since yesterday, all our senior colleagues have been expressing anguish and agony which I and my party also share. My party President an the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Dr. N. T. Rama Rao, was also the first person to condemn the incident. Madam, this incident clearly shows the inefficiency and incometence of the Government. Militants have entered into the Shrine which is a holy place for Hindus and Muslims, which stands as

a symbol of secularism, a symbol of peace. It has been destroyed now. In the last four years, during this Prime Minister's rule, we have seen that the Babri Masjid has been allowed to be destroyed and now, the Charar-e Sharief has also been allowed to be destroyed. How many more will be destroyed, God only should tell us.

When foreign mercenaries had entered the Shrine, it was the prime duty of the Prime Minister to tell the world that the State had been occupied by militants. He should have brought pressure from the world, especially from the Islamic rountries. But this did not happen. Recently, when the SAARC meeting was conducted here, the Pakistani President was here. At least then, he should have discussed this issue with the Pakistani President. That was also not done. The Prime Minister should own the responsibility for this. This is a fact.

Madam, on this occasion, I demand that smooth and effective steps should be taken to ensure safety to the people of the Valley This is not the time to conduct elections there. When the Prime Minister announced elections in 1993, Hazratbal was seized. Now, when he announced elections, Charar-e-Sharief was taken over by the militants. So, on this occasion, when the hon. Prime Minister is in the House, I request him not to go ahead with elections there. Let the more than three lakh Hindus who have fled the Valley, who have left their places come back. After they come back, let a healthy atmosphere be created there. After that if you hold elections there, it will be nice.

With these few words, Madam, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Prime Minister.

अब जरा ध्यान से सुनिए ।

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Madam, I am thankful to the hon. Members who have participated in the discussion and have given very good suggestions.

This is a great tragedy. We are all under great stress and agony that this should have happened. I would like to say, very briefly, that this is part of the activities being conducted by our neighbour, part of the low-cost proxy war that they have launched against us it has not been launched today. It has been going on for a pretty long time. This is the time for us to understand clearly what is being done by whom and what should be our look-out in a matter like this. Madam, it has been our endeavour that while we tackle these questions as they come, we should not lose sight of the fact that in any encounter like this, in any engagement like this, the possibility of a large number of casualties on the civil side should never be ruled out or ignored. That has been at the back of our mind in all these operations and I would like to submit that this has been observed as far as it was humanly possible. This time the strategy, which was adopted on some previous occasions, unfortunately, did not work. We know full-well that the strategy worked at the time of the Hazratbal crisis. We had a long time during which we did not know what was going to happen the next moment. It was touch-and-go all the time. It was a great test of our patience, perserverance and persuasiveness. Fortunately, it so happened that this patience paid off and we were able to save the shrine. We were able to save the shrine without any loss of life and without the troops having to enter the shrine or storm the

shrine. This was an achievement by itself and if those who were in charge of the operations thought that the same strategy should be adopted this time and they reported this is what they propose to do, there is no way that I can differ from that. I cannot send any instructions to the contrary, particularly when I am also convinced that if it has worked once, it could, perhaps, work once more, it will work once more. With that kind of confidence the operation took place on the same lines.

Now I am putting it very briefly. Some reports came earlier. What could we do? The point is that it is a town extremely congested and the shrine is a part of the town and it is just not possible for you to go and screen every person who is there, every person who is going into the shrine and coming out of the shrine. Hon. Members may remember that we had the same kind of problem in the Golden Temple about ten or eleven years ago. Even the presence of a police constable outside was resented. It will be resented, not only here but also in any shrine. If you want to post a policeman there, posting a policeman would mean something else. It is not just the man standing there. It would mean he is taking some action, becoming active on some score or the other. How and why, I cannot say. It is possible that something might happen in which the policeman standing there cannot just simply stand but has to do something else. Something may happen to a pilgrim. He may be beaten; he may be caught; he may be questioned, he may be frisked. In any case, a policeman standing there without frisking arrangement or power to frisk would be meaningless. So, where do we step? Where do we end this? What is the alternative? I don't think it is possible to frisk and screen everyone of the millions and millions of pilgrims visiting the shrines, all kinds of shrines, all religious shrines in this country. If this is the logic of the situation, it is very clear that once or twice, here or there, you may have to take the risk of someone going as a pilgrim into a shrine, taking possession of it and our having to deal with that situation. I think it is that simple. There is really nothing very complicated about it. I would say that in a crowded situation there are all kinds of possibilities. We do not expect anyone to defile a temple or a place of worship by making use of it in the wrong way. But many places can be used wrongly. When a place of worship is used wrongly—not only wrongly but with criminal intent—and becomes a ground of hostage in the hands of the terrorists, and if it is a wooden structure which can be burnt any moment, any second, if you storm, you will lose—both ways. You will lose the temple, you will lose the shrine because by the time you storm, the shrine would be gone. They would set fire to it. And in order to reach the temple, reach the shrine, you will have to shoot your way and in that haundreds of people, innocent people, might have to be shot or will be shot. So, what do we do? Do we save the people? Do we save the shrine? Ideally, I would like to save both. It happened in the case of Hazaratbal. It did not happen that way in the case of the Charar-e-Sharief. This is how it can be summed up.

Now, I am sure, somethink was said about the electoral process or the democratic process. I would like to be very clear on this. For the last one year, there has been a change in the atmosphere in Jammu and Kashmir. Until then we never thought of any democratic process because we dare not think of a democratic process while what was going on was just firing of shots from both the sides and setting on fire properties and all kinds of things. For instance, when we had this crisis of Hazaratbal, I am quite sure, we were not talking about elections or democratic process at all. We were only doing fire-fighting everyday, every hour. How is it that within the last one year or 10 months or 8 months to be more exact, people have started talking

about elections? Never mind what anyone says about elections. The fact is that he is saying something about elections. One party may say or one leader may say, "Elections are not possible. You are in a fool's paradise. You should not think of it." Another may say, "Yes, we can go in for elections. But what do we take to the people with us before going in for elections?" Another party might say, "Yes, it is time for elections. We must have elections." In this House and in the other House, the same kind of views, different views, have been expressed by hon. Members. I welcome all this. There is an atmosphere of democratic process. There is an air of democratic process in Jammu and Kashmir which has supplanted considerably the air of violence, the air of counter-violence. And this is the significant fact. We have not ordered elections. Dates have not been fixed for elections. When there is talk of elections, when there is talk of the democratic process, what else do we talk? We have welcomed the talk, the change in the atmosphere and we have taken certain actions. Leaders, were not in favour of the present set-up continuing, had different views. There is a party which wants that Kashmir should go to Pakistan. There are parties which want that Kashmir should be independent. And in the same manner there are different views held by different parties. They were not outside. They were in jail. The first thing we did was to release them. Let them come all over India, all over Kashmir. They were not allowed, perhaps, to visit some places because they were in jail. They were allowed to visit the whole of the country. They were allowed to talk to anyone. They have been talking to our leaders here. I am glad to say that the leaders of the Opposition parties have been good enough to share the gist of their conversation with me. I am taking into account all these conversations. I am taking into account the possibilities thrown up or not thrown up by these conversations. I am glad that I am able to see some light at the end of the tunnel. What they meant by Azadi may not mean total independence. It may mean something less. It may be something which we may not reject, hopefully. But I am not sure of anything at the moment. That is why the dialogue is on. I promise the Parliament that after I have had another round of discussions with those leaders who have had discussions with the leaders of J&K, I shall come back to the House with a more definite plan of action or approach or whatever you might call it. This has been my apprach to the whole question. You can certainly discuss whether elections are possible or not possible. But there is a constraint, in the sense that the 18th of July is the cut-off date, after which you cannot continue with the President's Rule there unless the Parliament legislates to that effect. That constraint can be converted into an advantage. It can be converted into an opportunity. But if you cannot do it, the Parliament is always ready, I am sure, to extend the President's Rule. But should I give up now? Should I give up even before I have started? Should I start with the assumption that elections are not going to be possible? We have been saying so. We have been saying so. We have been saying that the democratic process has to start. There are many reasons for it. I am not obeying anybody else by saying this. I am only saying that elections should take place. I am only saying that the democratic process should be started because, after a few years, in fact, after one or two years, the advantage of having the President's Rule, the effect of all that happened during the President's Rule, the power, the concentration of power and the absence of popular representatives, according to our Constitution, starts taking the path of diminishing returns. Now, we have completed five years in Kashmir. We have

seen both the rules. We have gone through the President's rule in many other States. We have found, and I am sure the House will agree with me, that, after some time, the President's Rule becomes something which can be dispensed with. We should make haste as far as possible without, of course, affecting the situation there adversely. We should have a popular Government. That is what we are trying to do. We are still trying to do it. We cannot give up in advance. The process has started. The people have come out. There is a dialogue going on. The talk of democratic process is very much in the air. When all this is happening, I would plead with the House to let this go on. Let us go on with this dialogue. Let us know where we stand I feel that sometimes if the people want, even miracles can happen. When if people wanted, miracles have happened in this country. Political parties have lost. Parties have gone out of power and parties have suddenly come into power. Parties have been swept off their feet. What is it that people cannot do, if they really want to do it? I have faith in the good sense of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. It is true that today it may be impossible. It is the fear of the gun. What is it we have been saying? We have been saying only one thing: People are fed up with the gun. But there is a fear of gun. It is true. We have seen it in other areas. It does not happen that when a thing like this takes place, unfortunate as it is, people do not stand up in their seats and say that terrorists have done it. Generally people do not have that courage. It is only an odd person here and there who will stand up to this. If you go along a road and find something happening there, people would like to circumvent it, go through a different lane and avoid being a witness to that particular scene. But there are people who will face the scene, who will stand there and who will certainly do something about it. So, there are all kinds of people. Today I do not expect anyone to stand up in the streets of Srinagar or in other places and say that so and so had done it and if in that kind of fear they say that it is the Government's failure to save our shrine, I would not join issue with them. I understand their position. But facts are facts. It is the terrorists, trained, funded, inspired and sent by Pakistan who have done this. It is known to every one. In this country, there may be Doubting Thomasses. I don't know why. But no one doubts it. Today every country in the world knows what Pakistan's role is in Jammu and Kashmir. I am glad to say that I don't have to repeat it now. I had to say this as the Head of the Government three years ago and I don't have to repeat it now. So, it is well-known, whatever Pakistan might say. There may be this conference or that conference. All the antics notwithstanding, people all over the world, Governments all over the world, know what is happening in Jammu and Kashmir. We have shown our *bona fides*. We have shown our utmost restraint. We have shown our utmost respect for human rights. We were being assailed on human rights three years ago. I am sure that that the attack has been muted to such an extent that sometimes I am on the offensive and say 'human rights for whom?'. And then there is no answer. There are no human rights for an ordinary citizen who is killed in the dead of night, for those people who were dragged out of the buses in Punjab and Kashmir and shot in a row all round! So, human rights are for all human beings. Human rights were not necessarily reserved for terrorists. This has been accepted. This has been appreciated. In fact, I was quite plain about it. I am glad that the human rights activists today are a little more balanced about this. So, these are the situations and we would like the democratic process to come in. Let us all sit and find out. Even today, we have different views. Let us sit and find out. In fact, I have more or less completed one round of discussions with the Leaders of the Opposition parties. I would like

to have another round and at the end of it, if things go well, there can be a dialogue directly with those who hold certain views on what Jammu and Kashmir should get or what the dispensation should be so long as it is within the Indian Constitution. Those who are against the Constitution, those who want to go out of India, there is no meeting ground beteen them and us. But within the Constitution, flexible as it is, imaginative as it is, varied as it is, if it is possible to find a particular dispensation for a particular area, I think that is the victory of the Constitution. I would like to uphold that as a victory of the Indian Constitution and, therefore, of the concept of Indian unity. When we talk of 'unity in diversity', this is what it is. It is not a slogan. If you don't have diversity and you want uniformily all over the country, this is not possible and we all know it. Therefore, here is a test of our unity in diversity. Here is a test of the Constitutin, the imaginative nature of our Constitution, the flexible nature of our Constitution, which allows so many varieties of co-existence with unity. So, this is the challenge before us, if I may suggest.

One of the leaders actually told me, Madam—and I thank him for having said that—"The time has not yet come for you to have direct talks. Let us talk first. We will come back to you". I am grateful to that leader. If I start talking and if he disagrees, what else is there? Are we going back to the bush? Are we going back to insurgency? There must be some buffer. The leaders who have offered to become a buffer are doing a very good job. I don't want to name them. Many of them are from different parties. I am very grateful to them for the very great job that they are doing. When the time comes, I will come out openly with all the facts. Give me a title time. I have been overtaken by this incident. Otherwise, the things were going on very well.

It is a setback, as I have said. I have said it to the Press. I have said it openly. It is a setback to the process that we have set in motion. But this setback cannot browbeat us to the extent of giving up the process. I will not. In fact, my determination is all the more today than what it was on the 8th of May. And, that should be the spirit in which we go ahead. If we are browbeaten, if we loose heart just because someone has sent a few fellows from across the border to create trouble here, if this kind of a trouble can deter us from our determination, we don't deserve to exist. This nation has to exist through all these trials and tribulations. We have to make the nation strong enough, determined enough, to exist through all this. We have existed and we will continue to exist. We will get over all these troubles. I have no doubt that we will get over all these troubles. During the last 45 or 47 years, no trouble in India has continued for ever. Take Nagaland, take Mizoram or take any part of the country. There is hardly any part which has not had a trouble—a trouble of some kind or the other; troubles of many kinds at the same time, if you wish. But we have got out of it. The country has got out of it. The unity of India and the genius of the people of India have found ways of getting out of it. This is the faith with which we are going.

For the rest, I have been asked all kinds of details—who did what? Why one-and-a-half kilometers and why not one and a half yards, and all these kinds of things. Madam, I must say that so far as operational details are concerned, no instructions are sent from Delhi, ever, whether it is the details of the Bangladesh war or any other counter insurgency operations in the North-East right now. I cannot say to the

person who is conducting the anti-insurgency operations there, to do this and not to do this. This kind of thing, I cannot do. We never do that. We discuss with them the general details of what they wish to do. We give a general kind of approval and let them go head. The results are mixed many times. The results are unqualified success many times. The results are that our people are ambushed sometimes. All these results notwithstanding, there is no instruction from here. There is no back-seat driving from here. It is just not possible and it is not done. If there are any doubts in any quarter, I would like to clear them. Now, having said that, I would like Members of Parliament, if they want to know more about it. I would not like to keep them in the dark, I would not like that they be kept in the dark. We are proposing the leaders of the Opposition have proposed and I have accepted, that an all party delegation could go to Jammu and Kashmir at the proper time and, in fact, I am not quite sure whether the town has been handed over back to the civil authorities it was to be done today, I expect that it will be done today; it has been done. So, let them be ready to receive us, to receive the Members of Parliament. I have spoken, the authorities said, "Yes, you are welcome." Then, when you are given a presentation of what happened by those who are conducting the operation there, all doubts can be cleared. The Members of Parliament have a right to know and whatever they want, I am sure, the information will be supplied to them But. I cannot accept the demand for a judicial inquiry. Operations like this, campaign like this—I am told there has been a demand are not ever made subject of judcial inquiries, Madam. So, I would respectfully submit that that demand may not be made.

There is an allegation that there is no coordination between the army and civil authorities. Now, this again....

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : जाफर शरीफ साहब आ गए है। इन्होंने एक बयान दिया है, उस पर भी कुछ कहिए।

उपसभापति : पूरी बात प्रधान मंत्री को बोलने दीजिए। बोल रहे हैं, अभी पूरा नहीं किया है।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : रेल मंत्री जी आ गए हैं इसलिए यह बात हम कह रहे हैं।

उपसभापति : अभी तो व रहेंगे ही। पांच बज उनको रेल के बारे में बयान देना है।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Madam, wherever there are different agencies in any counter-insurgency operation, there has to be co-ordination between them and no one can claim that at all times this co-ordination is perfect. We came across this problem not only here. everywhere and with respect to J & K, I must say that we have given a little more attention to this problem than in other places because it became necessary. There is a single command there. We had to put in a single command and the other agencies, other para-military forces, etc., had to work in co-ordination with, in some cases, they were in charge. For instance, in Srinagar town it is the para-military forces which are completely in charge. In other places it is the army in charge, but the co-ordination machinery works well, has worked fairly well. I am not saying that it has worked perfectly, but then there are imperfections everywhere, they are also human beings. But, whenever something has been brought to our notice, we have tried, after discussions,

to set that right. For instance, I am constantly in touch with the Army Chief and he gives his instructions to his corps commanders, whoever they are, who are in operation. Mostly it is the borders and those areas which the army has to look after. The other matters except when the army is called in, are looked after by the other forces. This is the arrangement which is the correct arrangement. Now, details I cannot go into because details can differ from day to day or operation to operation. So, I would not like to elaborate on the details and this is all I could say. Yes, the co-ordination between the army and civil authorities is a matter which is engaging our attention constantly and wherever there is something going wrong, we look into it and set it right. This is all I can assure the House. I think, I have covered the new points made here and whatever I had to say. The question about my colleague the Railway Minister, saying that The question about my colleague, the Railway Minister, saying that India should be prepared to wage a war with Pakistan and frustrate its designs on Kashmir, I do not know whether I should request him to tell you what he said and what has been reported. .(*Interruptions*). .. It looks very odd that while he is sitting in the House, I should say what he said and comment on it and give an interpretation. Would you like to say something, Mr. Jaffer Sharief? With your permission, Madam, I would like the Railway Minister to intervene. May be, at the end, after I have finished, you could call him for a couple of minutes. I feel that this is not correctly reported but let me not say anything in his presence here. I cannot presume anything because I have no knowledge of it. This has been brought to my notice ffiust now.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : सदर साहिबा, इससे पहले कि हमारे शमशेर जंग बुजुर्ग तशरीफ लाए हैं....

†[] "شری سکندر بخت: صدر صاحبہ۔ اس سے پہلے کہ ہمارے شمشیر جنگ بزرگ تشریف لائے ہیں۔۔۔"

उपसभापति : शमशीरे लाना तो मना है हाउस में।

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : सदर साहिबा, मैं खुश हूं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब वक्त निकाल सके राज्य सभा के लिए।

†[] شری سکندر بخت: صدر صاحبہ۔ میں خوش ہوں کہ پرائم منسٹر صاحب وقت نکال سکے راجیہ سبھا کیلئے۔

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव हां ऐसी क्या बात थी ?

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब आज राज्य सभा के लिए वक्त निकाल सके । प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने डिफरेंट व्यूज की बात की है, बहुत बड़ी बात की है :

खिरद का नाम जुनूं रख दिया, जुनूं का खिरद,
जो चाहे आपका हुस्ने करिश्मा साज करे ।

†[] شری سکندر بخت: پرائم منسٹر صاحب آج راجیہ سبھا کیلئے وقت نکال سکے۔ پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے ڈفرنٹ ویز کی بات کی ہے۔ بہت بڑی بات کی ہے:۔

خرد کا نام جنوں رکھ دیا۔ جنوں کا خرد
جو چاہے آپ کا حسن کرشمہ ساز کرے۔

†[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

Mr. Prime Minister, let me tell you your strategy at Hazratbal, you are proud of what you did at Hazratbal and what you achieved. How will you feel if I tell you that your strategy at Hazratbal created the trategedy at Charar-e-Sharief?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I feel that it is not correct.

श्री सिकंदर बख्त : मैं कह रहा हूं कि हजरत बल में जो कुछ हुआ, नहीं होना चाहिए था। आपने इबादतगाह और दरगाहों को डिफाइल करने की बात की। आपने यह जिम्मेदारी खुद ले ली है, दुनिया भर की इंटरनेशनल कम्युनिटी के सामने। जब कि डिफाइल वे करते हैं जो दरगाहों में घुसते हैं, हथियार लेकर, बदनियति लेकर, बुरे इरादे लेकर। आपने पूरे मुल्क को ले जाकर इस हैसियत में खड़ा कर दिया है, जो किसी दरगाह के अंदर जाकर किसी गुनहगार को निकाल कर लायें, जो गुनहगार इस दरगाह के तकद्दुस को पामाल कर रहे हैं, तो वे गुनहगार हो जायेंगे। यह एक बुनियादी, बेसिक ट्रेजिडी है।

†[شری سکندر بخت: میں کہہ رہا ہوں کہ حضرت بل میں جو کچھ ہوا۔ نہیں ہونا چاہیئے تھا۔ آپنے عبادتگاہ اور درگاہوں کو ڈی فائل کرنے کی بات کی۔ آپنے یہ ذمہ داری خود لے لی ہے۔ دنیا بھر کی انٹرنیشنل کمیونٹی کے سامنے۔ جبکہ ڈی فائل وہ کرتے ہیں جو درگاہوں میں گھستے ہیں۔ ہتھیار لیکر۔ بدنیت لیکر۔ برے ارادے لیکر۔ آپنے پورے ملک کو لے جاکر اس حیثیت میں کھڑا کر دیا جو کہ کسی درگاہ کے اندر جا کر کسی گنہگار کو نکال لائیں۔ جو گنہگار اس درگاہ کے تقدس کو پامال کر رہے ہیں تو وہ گنہگار ہو جائیں گے۔ یہ ایک بنیادی بیسک ٹریجڈی ہے]†

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not opening a debate. He did not participate and that is why.. .. .. (*Interruptions*). .. You are not opening a debate.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: I am not. I have certain questions.

सदर साहिबा मुझे बोलना होता तो मैं बोल लेता। मैं आपसे दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि मुझे चंद मिनट दिए जाएं। मेहरबानी करके अगर मुझ चंद मिनट वगैर इंटरप्शन के मिल जायं तो मैं ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लूंगा।

मैं आपसे अर्ज कर रहा था कि आपने "वी" का इस्तेमाल किया, प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने। सदर साहिबा, मैं आपके जरिए पूछना चाहता हूं कि :

†[شری سکندر بخت: صدر صاحبہ۔ مجھے بولنا ہوتا تو میں بول لیتا۔ میں آپ سے درخواست کرونگا کہ مجھے چند منٹ دیئے جائیں۔ مہربانی کرکے اگر مجھے چند منٹ بغیر انٹرپشن کے مل جائیں تو میں زیادہ وقت نہیں لونگا۔

میں آپ سے عرض کر رہا تھا کہ آپنے "وی" کا استعمال کیا۔ پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے۔ صدر صاحبہ، میں آپکے ذریعے پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ]†

†[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

Translireaation in Arabic Script.

Who is 'we'? Is it the Central Government, or, the Jammu & Kashmir Government, or, the Army or, is the Central Government, the Prime Minister's Office?...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Before you go further in this questionnaire, I would say: when we generally say 'we'. it depends on the situation about which we are talking When I say 'we' in respect of the operation,I mean those authorities who are in charge of the opreation. Since I cannot say all that long thing, I say, 'we'. 'We can mean the Central Government, 'we' can mean myself, 'we' can mean the authorities there and the State Government. So, please do not pick holes in these things because I am only trying to use one pronoun for fitting every situation and it will mean different things in different situations. Please. If that is the difficulty with you, I can change my text; wherever it is. I will put the appropriate thing there. Madam, with your permission, I can do that. It may be treated so and it may be deemed to be so. (*Interruptions*)

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : मेरा आखिरी सवाल है सदर साहिबा, मुझे रोकिए नहीं । आपने एक बात कश्मीरी के आजादी का नाम लेते हुए कही ।

†[] شری سکندر بخت : میرا آخری سوال ہے - صدر صاحبہ - مجھے روکئے نہیں - آپنے ایک بات کشمیر کے آزادی کا نام لیتے ہوئے کہی -]

We may not reject it; we may accept something; something milder, softer, words are yours

मुझे शदीद तरीन एतराज है इस पर । मुझे एतराज नहीं है, इस मुल्क को एतराज होगा । आप किस किस्म के सिग्नल देना चाहते हैं उन लोगों को जो लोग कश्मीर को हिन्दुस्तान से अलाहिदा करना चाहते हैं । बहुत सख्त एतराज है । देखिय, ज्युडिशियल इन्क्वायरी के खिलाफ हम कत्तई है, हम कत्तई यह साफ कर चुके है । एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं । डाइवर्सिटी के लफ्ज का आपने इस्तेमाल किया है ।

Have you identified the areas of diversity?

इतना लूजली इस्तेमाल होता है यह लफ्ज कि इसके कोई मायने नहीं रहे ।

†[] شری سکندر بخت : مجھے شدید ترین اعتراض ہے اس پر - مجھے اعتراض نہیں ہے - اس ملک کو اعتراض ہوگا آپ کس قسم کا سگنل دینا چاہتے ہیں ان لوگوں کو جو لوگ کشمیر کو ھندوستان سے علیحدہ کرنا چاہتے ہیں - بہت سخت اعتراض ہے - دیکھئے - جوڈیشیل انکوائری کے خلاف ہم قطعی ہیں ہم قطعی صاف کر چکے ہیں ایک بات اور کہنا چاہتا ہوں - ڈائیورسٹی کے لفظ کو آپنے استعمال کیا ہے -]

Have you identified the areas of diversity?

†[] اتنا لوزلی استعمال ہوتا ہے یہ لفظ کہ اسکے کوئی معنی نہیں رہے -]

Diversity can be very dangerous for the unity itself. Therefore, this word should be used 'only identifying'.

आखिरी बात यह है कि :

†[] آخری بات یہ ہے کہ :]

†[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

†[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

उपसभापति : सिकन्दर बख्त साहब, अगर प्रधान मंत्री . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : नहीं, नहीं, मैं बैठ जाता हूं ।

†[شری سکندر بخت : نہیں نہیں میں بیٹھ جاتا ہوں ۔]

श्री पी०वी० नरसिंह राव: नहीं, नहीं कोई बात नहीं **(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one second. एक मिनट बैठिये । I can protect the rights of Sikander Bakht Saheb as the Leader of the Opposition.

सिकन्दर बख्त साहब, सब के कहने पर, सब की रिक्वेस्ट पर प्रधान मंत्री साहब को बुलाया **(व्यवधान)** एक सेकेंड, मेरी बात सुन लीजिये **(व्यवधान)**

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: अपनी बात कहने के लिए उनको बुलाया था, यह क्या बात है **(व्यवधान)**

†[شری سکندر بخت : اپنی بات کہنے کیلئے انکو بلایا تھا - یہ کیا بات ہے "مداخلت" ۔]

उपसभापति: एक मिनट, प्लीज आप सुनिये **(व्यवधान)**

I announced that the Home Minister requested the Prime Minister on your request and the Lok Sabha is waiting for his reply. Let us understand the technical difficulty also. The Prime Minister came here at 3'O clock. I allowed some of the Members who had not spoken to speak. Now, if you want to go into the details of every line of the Prime Minister's speech, then let us open another debate tomorrow. We cannot go on like this.

मौलाना अबेदुल्ला खान आजमी : सिर्फ बयान सुनने के लिए बुलाया था, हम इस बात से मुतमईन नहीं हैं **(व्यवधान)**

†[مولانا عبید اللہ خان اعظمی : صرف بیان سننے کیلئے بلایا تھا ہم اس بات سے مطمئن نہیں ہیں - "مداخلت"]

उपसभापति : बयान सुनने के लिए बुलाया था, बैठ जाइये आप । **(व्यवधान)** आप बैठिये । डिबेट नहीं हो रहा है इस पर । **(व्यवधान)** बिलकुल नहीं, बैठिये **(व्यवधान)** जो आपने कल सवाल उठाये थे, उन्होंने जवाब दे दिया । अब आप बैठ जाइये । **(व्यवधान)**

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : प्रधान मंत्री जी आपके तशरीफ लाने की खबर जब मैंने सुनी, मुझे बोलना था मैंने विदड्रा कर लिया । बड़ी खुशी की बात है आप तशरीफ लाइये, मुझे नहीं बोलना । मैं चंद सवाल तीन मिनट में नहीं कर सकता क्या ? **(व्यवधान)** यह क्या बात हुई **(व्यवधान)**

†[شری سکندر بخت : پردھان منتری جی - آپکے تشریف لانے کی خبر جب میں نے سنی - مجھے بولنا تھا - میں نے وڈڈرا کر لیا - بڑی خوشی کی بات ہے آپ تشریف لائے - مجھے نہیں بولنا - میں چند سوال تین منٹ میں نہیں کر سکتا کیا - . . . "مداخلت" . . . یہ کیا بات ہوئی . . . "مداخلت" . . .]

†[ ]Transliteration in Arabic Script.

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

उपसभापति : आप करिये (**व्यवधान**)

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : मैं कोई कड़वाहट में सवाल नहीं कर रहा हूं । देखिये, हमारे सीनों में कश्मीर के लिए आग लग रही है । हम इसको सियासी रकाबत का जरिया नहीं बनाना चाहते हैं । हम इसको हिन्दुस्तान का मसला मानते हैं । हम उस आग को शेयर करना चाहते है आपसे । उसको शेयर करने का मौका आप नहीं देना चाहती हैं सदर साहेबा । आप शौक से न दें ।

†[شری سکندر بخت : میں کوئی کڑواہٹ میں سوال نہیں کر رہا ہوں - دیکھئے ہمارے سینوں میں کشمیر کے لئے آگ لگ رہی ہے - ہم اسکو سیاسی رقابت کا ذریعہ نہیں بنانا چاہتے ہیں - ہم اسکو ہندوستان کا مسئلہ مانتے ہیں - ہم اس آگ کو شیئر کرنا چاہتے ہیں آپ سے - اسکو شیئر کرنے کا موقع آپ نہیں دینا چاہتی ہیں - صدر صاحبہ - آپ شوق سے نہ دیں]

उपसभापति : बोलिये सिकन्दर बख्त साहब । मेरे ऊपर गुस्सा रख कर अपना गुस्सा मत उतारिये ।

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : नहीं नहीं, मैं गुस्सा नहीं कर रहा हूं । (**व्यवधान**)

†[شری سکندر بخت : نہیں نہیں - میں غصہ نہیں کر رہا ہوں "مداخلت"]

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do not try to show your anger towards me because you are not satisfied with something.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया । हो गया ।

†[شری سکندر بخت : بہت بہت شکریہ - ہو گیا -]

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : I had yielded deleberately because I did not want to be rude or unyielding to the Leader of the Opposition. Whatever he has to say, I wanted him to say; to go on record. It is his right as a Member of Parliament and as the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps he has a little more to say. That right, I am not denying it to him. I would only say that he has come to the House with what he wanted to say. Whatever I say, he will have his say. That is what I think and he should be allowed to say. Since he is not wanting to say anything more. I have only to submit to the House that no matter what views we hold, I entirely agree with the spirit of what he said, that this is not a matter of a party, it is not a matter of a party at all; this is a national problem, a national question. We all want to solve it and in that solution, we may differ. I feel that the Indian Constitution is flexible enough, imaginative enough to find a way for co-existence as a nation. It has found several formulate for several areas. We know it. The Constitution abounds in such provisions. So, it is my faith that it is the same Indian Constitution we are proud of without ever violating in any aprticular respect, is capable of finding a solution of co-existence in the case also. One may call it something else but when we really want one to explain, one will tell you a few rights, right of this, right of that right of that. The Indian Constitution has an array of rights already defined, powers already defined. If it is only a question of making a little ad-

4.00 P.M.

justment with those powers which the Constitution already contains, that is what I call the achievement of unity through diversity, which means we have different areas, we have different dispensations and all of them are covered by the over-arching Indian Constitution. This is what I say. If that is not acceptable to any Member, he is of course entitled to his views. But, this is what I think should be done, can be done and if conditions permit, will be done.

उपसभापति : जाफर शरीफ साहब आप बोलेंगे . . . (**व्यवधान**) आप बोलने तो दीजिए !: इसलिए तो मैं उनको कह रही हूं

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI C. K. JAFFER SHARIEF): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to you and I am grateful to the hon. Prime Minister for giving me this opportunity. It is but natural when I have made some statement about which Members have some concern obviously the Prime Minister cannot answer, that too when I am here. Secondly, I do understand my limits. As a Member of the Government, propriety demands that I cannot make such statements because the Defence Minister or the Prime Minister should have made such statements. But, nevertheless, as an Indian, the way Pakistan is continuously creating problems for our country, for our people, the people of Kashmir... (Interruptions)... Please bear with me. (Interruptions)

Madam, I have not come here for a debate.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : बाकी मिनिस्टर्स इंडियन नहीं हैं क्या ? (**व्यवधान**)

श्री सी०के० जाफर शरीफ : मैं बताऊं मिश्रा जी । फर्क इतना ही है कि बाकी हिन्दू हैं मैं मुसलमान हूं । मुसलमान के दिमाग में जो . . . (**व्यवधान**) सुनिए न मेरी बात जरा . . . (**व्यवधान**)

सुनने दीजिए ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, he said right at the outset that he is a Minister and he is also an Indian. As an Indian, he has certain sentiments and he has a right to express them.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Let him speak.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : मैडम हमने पूछा कि बाकी मिनिस्टर्स आपकी कैबिनेट के इंडियन हैं कि नहीं ?

श्री सी० के० जाफर शरीफ : सब हैं ।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : इस पर आप इतना गुस्सा क्यों कर रहे हैं ।

श्री सी०के० जाफर शरीफ : जब पूछ रहे हैं तो बोलने दीजिए . . . (**व्यवधान**)

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : इसलिए कि आप मुसलमान के घर में पैदा हो गए और मुरली मनोहर जोशी हिन्दू के घर में पैदा हुए ? यह बोलने का ढंग नहीं है . . . (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Madam, I would like to say that, whatever he said about frustrating Pakistani designs, he has caused a little frustration to me by being here at this moment. If anything has been said under stress, one can understand if, I understand it, but I would like to say that waging war against Pakistan is not the policy of the Government. If as an Indian anyone wants it, it is a different matter but I would like to clarify this. He is a Minister, he is under pressure. He is under psychological pressure. He has just come out of a ghastly railway accident in the South. Therefore, we have to give him some margin. I would like him not to say anything more. (Interruptions)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: We readily agree to giving him the margin, as requested by the Prime Minister. We readily agree. (Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I suggest and propose that a general amnesty be granted to Shri Jaffer Sharief.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : And we are sorry that he has caused frustration to the Prime Minister. (Interruptions)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, with your permission, can I ask one question?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If I allow you, I will have to allow half-a-dozen other people. There would not be any end to this. The discussion on this is concluded.

Now, we have to resume the debate on the Budget. (Interruptions) Shri S. Jaipal Reddy.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I am not feeling well, Madam. I will speak tomorrow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Biplab Dasgupta.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Not today.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri S. S. Surjewala. (*Interruptions*) Order please, (*Interruptions*) Can I have some peace in the House? (Interruptions) We have one hour left today for the Budget discussion. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Madam, as a sign of being released from frustration, it seems some people would like to go out. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please listen. (*Interruptions*) Theer are two statements listed for 5 o' Clock. (*Interruptions*) Order, please. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: You adjourn the House till 5 p.m. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would like to have peace in the House. Those who don't want to sit in the House can go out. (*Interruptions*) We have only one hour left for the Budget discussion today. Mr. Jaipal Reddy is not feeling well and, therefore, he does not want to speak today. I think we can take up the discussion on the Budget. Then, we also have the Clarifications on the railway accident. But the Railway Minister is not here.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: We should give some time to the Railway Minister to cool down. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRAN: The Home Minister is here. He has got two statements. If the House so agrees, we can ask him to lay these two statements on the Table of the House. Then, tomorrow, we could resume the discussion on the Budget in the morning itself and have no interruptions of any kind.

SHRI JANESHWAR MISRA: What about the Calling-Attention Motion, Madam?

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : There is a Calling-Attention tomorrow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think we are taking the Budget too lightly this year. (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MARGARET ALVA): Madam, the discussion on the Budget has to be completed quickly. Otherwise, the discussion on the working of the Ministries would not be possible. (Interruptions))

THE DEPUTY CHAIRAN: Now, Mr. Home Minister, you can lay both your statements on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Withdrawal of Restricted Area Permit from Assam, Meghalaya and Tripura

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a statement regarding the withdrawal of Restricted Area Permit (RAP) from the States of Assam, Meghalaya and Tripura.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Formation of Autonomous Hill Development Council for Ladakh

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a statement on the formation of Autonomous Hill Develop- Council for Ladakh.